DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 079 478 VT 020 354

TITLE	Negro Employment in the South. Volume 3: State and Local Governments.
INSTITUTION	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	Manpower-Res-Monogr-23
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	53p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (L1.39/3:Vol.3, $.85)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Employment Patterns; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Government Employees; Integration Methods; *Local Government; *Negro Employment; Public Policy; Racial Discrimination; *Southern States; *State Government; Statistical Data

ABSTRACT

This study is part of a manpower research project to analyze Negro employment patterns in the South and to suggest ways to improve them. Government is a major employer, especially during economic depressions when market forces have caused high unemployment in the private sector. Governments may be particularly important sources of jobs for Negroes and other minorities in equal employment opportunity implementation. Data are presented for racial patterns of employment by agency category and labor type in 13 Southern states. It was found that geographic location alone cannot explain the racial employment patterns. Leadership by State and local officials and pressure from the community, black and white, are also very important, and the community organization is as important as legislation in causing any changes in the patterns. The study also indicated the need for better data on Negro employment in State and local governments. The data are especially limited at the municipal level. Conclusions and recommendations offer guides for the administration and enforcement of equal employment opportunities. Volume 1 and 2 of this project are available as ED 048 486 and ED 067 496 respectively. (MF)

ED 079478

JUL 1 1973

NEGRO EMPLOYMENT IN THE SOUTH

Volume 3 : State and Local Governments

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR / Manpower Administration

MANPOWER RESEARCH MONOGRAPH NO. 23

VT020354

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 079478

Manpower Research
Monograph No. 23
1973

NEGRO EMPLOYMENT IN THE SOUTH

Volume 3: State and Local Governments

This report was prepared for the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under a research contract (No. 81-19-68-13) authorized by title I of the Manpower Development and Training Act. Since contractors performing research under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their own judgment, the report does not necessarily represent the Department's official opinion or policy. Moreover, the contractor is solely responsible for the factual accuracy of all material developed in the report.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Peter J. Brennan, Secretary
MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price 85 cents domestic postpaid or 60 cents GPO Bookstore

FOREWORD

The present study of Negro employment in State and local governments in the South is part of a research project on Negro Employment in the South (NES) funded jointly by the Manpower Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor, under its broad program of sponsoring research into manpower problems by persons outside the Federal Government, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The NES project seeks to present and analyze the latest evidence on Negro employment to determine the factors responsible for both the patterns discovered and the causes of (or impediments to) change. However, our basic objective is not only to explain the patterns of black employment, but to suggest remedies which might make it possible for Negroes to improve their employment and upgrading opportunities.

In each of our studies we are concerned with two basic indicators of the Negro's relative employment status: (1) A penetration rate, showing the extent to which Negroes have entered various employment categories; and (2) an index of occupational position, showing the relative status they occupy within those categories.

In addition to the present study, the NES project includes studies of the Negro in southern agriculture, Negro employment in the Federal service, and special studies of Negro employment in Atlanta, Birmingham, Houston, Louisville, Memphis, Miami, and New Orleans. We chose agriculture as a special area for study because of its obvious importance for overall Negro employment problems in the South, and indeed the Nation. The migration of Negroes out of southern agriculture clearly has been one of the most significant developments in American history. Moreover, agriculture still provides more employment for Negroes than the four leading nonagricultural industries in the South.

We chose cities as special areas to study Negro employment for several reasons. First, we believe that racial problems must be resolved primarily by programs at the city level, supported by State, Federal, and private assistance. It is therefore important to have studies which portray the realities of each metropolitan area. We are persuaded, moreover, that comparative metropolitan studies will give greater insights into the unity and diversity of Negro employment in the South. We therefore hope to isolate those patterns and causal relationships which are uniform among cities from those which are unique to each place.

Government employment also is an important area to study. First, government is a major employer; indeed, it is a leading growth industry in terms of employment. Government is a particularly important source of employment in times of economic adversity because, although there are budgetary constraints on governments, market forces do not necessarily govern employment relations. Governments therefore can give employment to people at times when market forces have caused high unemployment in the private sector. Governments might be particularly important sources of jobs for Negroes and other minorities because these groups can use their political power to cause government to provide them with equal employment opportunities. Finally, government employment is important because public employees implement public policy. It clearly is not enough to get legislation on the books establishing equal employment opportunities, because the manner of implementation of legislation can sometimes thwart the intentions of lawmakers. Therefore, if Negroes can get public jobs, they bring strong reinforcement to those white civil servants who are committed to the carrying out of equal employment opportunity policies.

The present study by Dr. David F. Ross produces some significant generalizations about Negro employment in State and local governments, although there are few current data. As Dr. Ross points out, his data are particularly limited on Negro employment patterns at the municipal level; his data are much better for the States. His generalizations are undoubtedly much more applicable to State than to local government employment, but some are nevertheless for government employment at all levels.

Dr Ross starts by classifying the basic patterns of Negro employment; namely, token employment, employment in traditionally Negro jobs, and employment by local governments which are controlled by blacks. The last is clearly a special case; tokenism and traditional employment are much more important. In order to provide a quantitative measure, Dr Ross developed indexes of tokenism. He points out that tokenism has both negative and positive effects for Negro employment. The positive aspects are that even token employment of Negroes has a significant educational

value and provides a foundation for further increases if programs are mounted to exploit the breakthroughs. The negative aspects are that tokenism itself may lead to very limited change while removing the pressure for change. Removing the pressure is extremely important for Dr. Ross' analysis because, as he points out, very little if any change is likely to come about in the absence of pressures.

Dr. Ross found the most significant changes in the areas of traditional Negro employment. Most of these jobs are menial or otherwise unpleasant, but some are status positions within the black community. Although blacks have lost some of these status positions because of desegregation, they have made significant gains in employment in a condition which Ross terms "the new segregation." This comes about where pressure from blacks causes Negroes to be employed in areas serving the black community. Ross argues that very limited employment changes have come about where the client groups could not be segregated and the black community therefore could exert little pressure on the employing governments.

In trying to factor out the basic causes of Negro employment patterns, Ross first considers geography, on the assumption that different modes of racial segregation will cause some States to be more progressive than others in providing Negro employment opportunities. The Border States and those in the upper south are supposedly more progressive, while the Deep South States might be expected to offer more resistance to employing Negroes in nontraditional jobs. However, as Ross points out, geography alone cannot explain the racial employment patterns.

Other factors, such as leadership by government officials and pressure from the black community or black clients, are also extremely important. The analysis leads Ross to test the hypothesis that "the effect of pressure generated from above varies in inverse proportion to the distance between the source and the point of pressure." As a consequence if pressure for a change comes from above, that is to say from the Governor's office, the change is not likely to go beyond tokenism unless leaders in the intermediate levels of government are prepared to continue the pressure. Indeed, the most effective pressure is not likely to be felt until first line supervisors are induced to take the appropriate steps to see that Negroes are employed or upgraded in accordance with their interests and abilities. In cases where employees are not visible to the public, it is very difficult for black clients to exert pressure to get more Negroes employed. As a consequence, in these agencies, leadership becomes extremely important.

Professor Ross concludes his study with a number of recommendations for improving Negro employment opportunities in State and local governments. First, he feels that title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 should be extended to governments, as was done in the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, approved after his study was completed. However, merely passing laws and taking the signs down will not cause significant changes to come about. Ross therefore recommends a number of affirmative action steps to make it possible for Negroes to acquire jobs.

A conclusion which follows hard on his analysis of the reasons for changes in Negro employment is that community organization is as important as legislation in getting significant change in racial employment patterns. Organization by the black community is important not only as a means of exerting pressure on government units to accept blacks, but also as a means of protecting blacks from economic and political reprisals.

It is also clear that the institutionalized patterns of racial discrimination will not be changed simply by announcing that discrimination is at an end. Ross' study might have emphasized that it clearly will be necessary for some agency to establish efforts to recruit, train, and prepare black applicants for governmental jobs. Moreover, Ross thinks it extremely important to pay attention to unnecessary barriers to government employment. He is particularly concerned about tests which might be both irrelevant and culturally biased and about governmental personnel selection procedures which facilitate discrimination, inadvertently or otherwise. Indeed, the traditional civil service rules are well suited to the purposes of segregationists, because these laws existed long before the intensification of equal employment pressures and were adopted for another purpose.

Ross is not optimistic about the effectiveness of antidiscrimination measures which are not accompanied by clearly assigned quotas for Negro employment. It must be conceded, though, that quotas might be counterproductive if they increased resistance to equal employment opportunities for Negroes, so that some alternative approach might be more successful. Such an approach might be for the Federal Government to fund outreach programs which are specifically designed to recruit and prepare people for employment in various governmental units by getting them ready to meet whatever requirements are imposed. These organizations could themselves adopt goals for getting Negroes employed and avoid the opposition which probably would arise if quotas were established.

Ross' study also indicates the need for better data on Negro employment in State and local governments. Dr. Ross has done a good job with the available data, but he emphasizes the need for much better data to facilitate understanding of the causes of unequal employment opportunities and as bases for remedial programs.

F. Ray Marshall, Director
Negro Employment in the
South Project

CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	iii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Token Integration	1
Traditional Negro Jobs	2
Menial and Otherwise Unpleasant Jobs	2
Status Positions With a Black Clientele	2
Negro-Controlled Governments	4
Methodology	4
II. STATE GOVERNMENTS	7
North Carolina	7
Kentucky	12
Tennessee	14
Louisiana	15
Georgia	16
Virginia	17
Texas	20
Alabama	24
III. FEDERALLY AIDED STATE AGENCIES	27
IV. SCHOOL DISTRICTS	35
V. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL UNITS	39
VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	43

List of Tables

TABLE	Page
1. North Carolina State Government: Racial Pattern of Employment by Category of Agency; Skilled Labor, July 1, 1968	8

TABLE Page

2. North Carolina State Government: Racial Pattern of Employment by Category of Agency; White-Collar and Supervisory Employees, July 1, 1968 11

3. Virginia State Government: Racial Pattern of Employment by Category of Agency; Skilled Labor, August 1969 18

4. Virginia State Government: Racial Pattern of Employment by Category of Agency; White-Collar and Supervisory Employees, August 1969 19

5. Texas State Government: Racial Pattern of Employment by Agency; Skilled Labor, September 30, 1968 21

6. Texas State Government: Racial Pattern of Employment by Agency; White-Collar Workers, September 30, 1968 22

7. Texas State Government: Significant Agencies Appearing to be Integrated; Number and Percent of Anglos and Negroes by Salary Level as of September 30, 1968 22

8. Texas State Government: Number and Percent of Anglos and Negroes by Salary Level as of September 30, 1968 24

9. Full-Time Employment by Race in Selected Federally Aided State Agencies, 1969 and 1970: Health 28

10. Full-Time Employment by Race in Selected Federally Aided State Agencies, 1969 and 1970: Welfare 29

11. Full-Time Employment by Race in Selected Federally Aided State Agencies, 1969 and 1970: Employment Security 30

12. Full-Time Employment by Race in Selected Federally Aided State Agencies, 1969 and 1970: Handicapped 31

13. Full-Time Employment by Race in Selected Federally Aided State Agencies, 1969 and 1970: Miscellaneous 32

14. Blacks in White-Collar Jobs, Federally Aided Agencies in 13 Southern States 33

I. INTRODUCTION

Negro employment in State and local governments in the South has undergone significant changes in the past decade. There is considerable variation among State and local governments in the degree of change, but the changes everywhere fall into two categories, plus one special case.

One category is token integration. This exists where the employment of Negroes is motivated not by the desire to achieve equal employment opportunities for all, but by the desire to satisfy the minimal expectations of some party outside the local power structure—the press, the Federal Government, local white liberals, or the local black community.

The second category is traditional Negro jobs: both those which are menial or otherwise unpleasant and those which involve serving the Negro sector of an agency's constituency. The precise definition of the former type varies from place to place and to some extent from time to time, depending upon conditions in the labor market. Manual labor on the public roads, for example, is often a Negro job; in an area where unemployment among whites is a serious problem, however, it is more likely to be a white job. Carrying garbage to the garbage truck is almost everywhere a Negro job; but driving the garbage truck may be either white or Negro, depending on the time and place. There is no evidence of any trend either way in this type of Negro job.

It is in the second category—traditional Negro jobs—that the most significant change numerically is taking place. The most important example is teaching in Negro public schools—a relatively high-status, professional-level job, long reserved in many communities for well-educated Negroes because it has involved serving an exclusively black clientele. The same is true of many occupations in the private sector (undertakers, ministers, doctors, lawyers, etc.) but has not generally been true in the public sector outside the educational field. There is now a fairly wide spread effort to employ blacks to work with blacks in such public sector areas as social work, public welfare and employment service administration, counseling, neighborhood police protection, and so on.

The special case (the third category) exists where Negroes constitute a majority of the voting population in a particular jurisdiction and gain control of the machinery of government.

Token Integration

Token integration in public employment was defined above in terms of motive. Motive is not significant, however, from the point of view of this study. Whether a Negro clerk or typist is hired because of fear, or love, or hope of gain is not important unless it affects employment conditions on the job. What is important is that token integration leads to very limited change. During the period of transition from no integration to token integration, a substantial number of new jobs may be opened up to Negroes, particularly in proportion to the number of qualified applicants readily available. Once the objective of a black in each office or department has been achieved, however, the creation of new employment opportunities ceases. The barrier has not been removed; it has simply been moved back one space. As with the former Jewish seat, and now presumably the black seat, on the U.S. Supreme Court, further appointments will be made only as replacements.

From the long range point of view of further progress, token integration can have both positive and

negative effects. The positive effects are of two types: educational and statistical. Many whites have never known a Negro on an equal basis. The experience, for such people, of having a Negro coworker or of dealing across the counter with a Negro, may in time help them to think of Negroes as individuals rather than as a class stereotype and thus make it easier for them to accept further progress. This effect is diminished by Americans' disposition to admit individual exceptions without weakening their class prejudices. It does exist, however, and it is reinforced by the statistical effect, which derives from the simple fact that the ratio of 1 to 0 is infinitely greater than the ratio of 2 to 1. Replacing the barrier loosens it and makes it easier to replace a second time, and a third. If these were the only effects of token integration, there would be no question that it would lead eventually to full integration. Unfortunately, the negative effect is a potent one and possibly outweighs the positive effects.

Token integration in every case has been the product of substantial pressure. The pressure has been of different forms, to be discussed later in this report, but it has always been strong where it has achieved results. The achievement of token integration reduces this pressure. The barrier would be easier to move a second time, but the motive power is gone. In some cases, this has been the deliberate purpose of token integration; in others, it has been the inadvertent effect of what was conceived as a total removal of barriers. It makes no difference; the question of motive is unimportant. Whether intentions are open or devious, benevolent or sinister, the presence of one black in the office tends to remove the pressure and stop the action. As token integration is the only kind of integration that affects government employment across the board, this negative effect is the major problem with which policymakers in this area must come to grips.

Traditional Negro Jobs

Menial and Otherwise Unpleasant Jobs. Numerically, Negroes fare rather well in public employment, particularly at the local level. This is because so much of the work of running a city is the disposal of waste. Technical progress has had little effect on the waste disposal problem to date, in large part because most cities have considerable numbers of able-bodied Negroes who are available to perform unpleasant manual labor for low wages. There are no technological barriers to the automation of waste disposal, and there can be no doubt that as the economic status of Negroes improves, their willingness to accept such work will diminish, their wage demands will escalate, and automation will eventually come to street cleaning, janitoring, and garbage collecting, as it has already come to sewage disposal. The effect on employment will be to reduce in number but enhance in quality the jobs in waste disposal. Ten black men pushing brooms will be replaced by one equipment operator with a street-sweeping machine. The problem of whether the equipment operator will be black or white merges with the general problem of employment opportunities for Negroes in State and local governments, and it will thus be separately discussed under this heading. What is important is that current government jobs of this nature are certain to disappear, like the Pullman porter and the cotton picker, and that a great many other positions must be opened to Negroes merely to keep their numerical representation in State and local government employment from falling drastically.

Status Positions With a Black Clientele. There are two types of situations in which the clientele served by a public employee may be segregated. Where the position involves serving the public in groups, the groups may be monochromic. In addition to schools, the obvious examples are hospitals, prisons, orphanages, parks and playgrounds, and neighborhoods. There has been no consistent pattern among southern governmental units except that Negroes almost never hold status positions serving segregated white populations or supervising white subordinates. Typically, black teachers are found in black schools, but it is not considered a violation of principle for a white teacher to have a black class unless the principal is black. The staff of a Negro public hospital may be Negro, white, or mixed. Prison administration is more likely to be white, as is neighborhood law enforcement in black neighborhoods, but the rule is not a strict one. What is important to the principles of segregation is that whites not take orders or receive direction from Negroes.

Two changes can be observed in processes affecting this type of position dealing with monochromic groups: One tends to increase employment opportunities for Negroes; the other tends to reduce them. The tendency to reduce the number results from the desegregation of public facilities. Where black and white schools are merged, for example, it becomes more difficult for Negro teachers to get jobs and earn promotions. There will undoubtedly be fewer Negro principals, deans, and college presidents in the South as school desegregation advances; there will probably be fewer Negro teachers and professors as well. To the extent that Negroes are now employed in segregated public hospitals, prisons, and other public facilities, and to the extent that these are desegregated, the

same tendency will be evident, although the impact of desegregation will depend upon the type of service rendered. A Negro doctor could be employed in an integrated hospital without ever having to examine a white patient or give orders to a white nurse; a Negro guard in an integrated prison could scarcely avoid exercising control over white prisoners. But in general, the trend will clearly be downward in terms of the number of positions open to Negroes.

The opposite tendency, for Negro entry to status positions with a black clientele served in monochromic groups to increase, is evident where desegregation of the groups is not taking place at a significant rate and where the positions have traditionally been held by whites. The clearest example of this situation is neighborhood law enforcement. Traditionally, Negro neighborhoods have been patrolled, if at all, by white policemen. Increasingly, this job is being taken over by Negro policemen, as a result of pressure from the black neighborhoods themselves. White city officials increasingly have been convinced that their lives will be simpler, and that the cause of law and order will be served better with black policemen patrolling black streets. White policemen have become more and more fearful of penetrating black neighborhoods and welcome their Negro fellow officers to take over that responsibility. It is significant, in this connection, that fire departments have been much slower than police departments in opening their employment rosters to Negroes. One reason for the difference is that, while policemen go out in ones and twos to cover small sections of the city, firemen go out in large groups to cover large sections of the city or the entire town. However, the fact that firemen live together, and share beds on a serial basis, is undoubtedly a more important factor accounting for white firemen's resistance to integration.

Segregated housing will probably be with us for a long time, but segregated public facilities are on the way out. As this type of Negro status position depends upon the maintenance of segregation, the net effect probably will reduce Negro entry.

The other situation involving status positions with a black clientele offers more hope for progress. This is the situation in which the clientele is dealt with on an individual rather than a group basis. Public welfare administration is one example. Applicants for public assistance, black and white, typically come to the same office. There may or may not be separate waiting rooms; but when an applicant's turn comes, he is served on a one-to-one basis—one caseworker to one case. In the past, the caseworker has been white, and he has handled all cases. Increasingly, Negro caseworkers are being employed. As with policemen, this is largely the result, directly or indirectly, of pressure from the black community. Administrators of public welfare programs have been convinced that their affairs will proceed more smoothly if Negro caseworkers deal with Negro cases. It is still unthinkable over much of the South that an indigent white man would seek aid from a well-dressed, educated, salaried Negro. But a sufficient proportion of applicants for public assistance are black to insure that black caseworkers can be fully employed without that becoming necessary. The same tendency is evident in fields of government enterprise such as employment security, public health nursing, and home economics extension. In all these fields, pressure from the local black community has been reinforced by pressure from the Federal Government, which supplies financial assistance to the locally administered programs. Ironically, response to the pressure has increased segregation in one sense. Where before, the client's chair at a caseworker's desk was occupied alternately by Negroes and whites, it now increasingly tends to serve a succession of a single color. It has, however, given Negroes opportunity to find status employment far beyond the degree provided by token integration, and even far beyond their proportion of the general population. Most of these opportunities exist in agencies largely serving the poor, and a disproportionate number of the poor are Negroes.

What limits this type of integration is the fact that a large proportion of jobs in State and local governments involve serving a clientele which cannot practically be segregated. The best example is the construction and maintenance of streets and highways. At the State level, this is the largest area of employment, and it is one of the two or three largest at the local level. Except for neighborhood streets, the clientele is necessarily mixed. It might be thought that this made no difference, as the clientele is not served on a direct and personal basis: white motorists surely would not object to driving on a street that had been repaired by Negroes. In fact, however, highway departments have consistently been among the slowest to open job opportunities to Negroes (except where prisoners are employed in road work). What seems to be crucial is not the fact that there are whites in the clientele to be served, but the fact that there is no separable black clientele to serve as a source of pressure. The situation is similar in natural resource conservation (forest rangers, game wardens, etc.), a good deal of law enforcement, particularly at the State level, and what for lack of a better term must be called general government—revenue administration, recordkeeping, etc. The case of fire departments has already been mentioned. Even in areas where a black clientele can be separated to be served by a black public employee, this same factor limits promotion. A welfare office may have

black and white caseworkers in proportion to its clients, but there is only one supervisor, and as long as integration is limited to its present categories, the supervisor will always be white.

Negro-Controlled Governments

The phenomenon of a governmental unit serving a population which is predominantly black has received much attention over the past several years, as whites emigrating from northern cities have been replaced by blacks emigrating from the South. Washington, D.C., has already gone well past the 50-percent mark, and such other cities as Detroit, Newark, and Chicago are not far behind. Only recently, however, have the political implications of black predominance come to the surface in the rural South, where the phenomenon has existed for a much longer time. The reason is, of course, that voting rights are only just beginning to be exercised by Negroes in those sections where they are numerically superior. As the effects of the Voting Rights Act have become more widely felt, increasing numbers of Negro public officials have been elected throughout the South. In most cases, however, they have been elected as members of boards or commissions on which they served as minority members or to positions carrying only limited administrative power (e.g., justice of the peace). In such positions, they have often been effective in bringing about changes in public employment policy by serving as a medium of communication between the black community and the still predominantly white power structure. More recently, however, the exercise of voting rights has actually changed the color of the political power structure from white to black in a few governmental units, and the number of such units is certain to increase substantially in the next several election years.

Methodology

Comprehensive data in support of the above observations are not available. Except in special cases, State and local governments were not required to maintain records or file reports on their employment practices, by race or otherwise, and the resources available for this survey dictated that primary reliance be placed on secondary source material. In the sections that follow, therefore, statistical data will be presented only on an illustrative basis. Some States have established their own equal employment opportunity agencies, under various names, which have conducted surveys of State government employment practices. A few surveys also have been made of city governments. A major source of data was the 1967 survey made by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights of minority group employment in State and local governments in seven Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas, four of which are in the South. A survey of federally aided State agencies, which are required by Federal law to use nondiscriminatory merit systems of employment, has been made for 1969 and 1970 by the Bureau of Intergovernmental Personnel Programs of the U.S. Civil Service Commission (formerly the Office of State Merit Systems in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare). Data from this survey are available only in the form of unprocessed questionnaire responses, and limitations of time and money did not permit their full processing for the use of the present study, but they have been consulted and employed to a limited extent. There are also scattered data which have been collected for public hearings and court actions in the civil rights field. The result is that some data, not necessarily comparable, are available for some agencies in all State governments and for all agencies in a few State governments, and for city and county governments in Houston, Baton Rouge, New Orleans, Memphis, Miami, Atlanta, Louisville, and Savannah. This coverage, while not ideal, provided an adequate sample of the South, except for the omission of smaller towns and rural counties. Some original research, therefore, was undertaken in such communities in Alabama, Georgia, and the Carolinas.

During the development of a system of classification, decisions had to be made concerning job levels and degrees of integration.

It is obvious that comparisons must be based on job level to be meaningful. Ten black janitors in one department do not constitute the same amount of integration as ten black accountants in another. The questions are where to draw the lines and how many lines to draw. These were answered, for purposes of the study, largely by two considerations: The classifications employed in available data, and the location of barriers to integration.

The first consideration sets the range of choice. If, for example, available data are classified into the categories "unskilled," "semiskilled," and "skilled" labor, we can employ these same categories, or we can group them (e.g., "skilled labor" and "all other"), but we cannot further subdivide them (e.g., "construction," "maintenance," etc., or "carpentry," "metalworking," etc.).

The second consideration dictates how this range of choice should be employed. There seems to be no particular barrier to the employment of Negroes as unskilled labor in government, but there is a distinct barrier to their entering the skilled labor category, either directly or by advancement from the unskilled category. There are also barriers to the employment of Negroes in white-collar positions. These jobs cover a wide range of income, status, and years of preparation required—from stenographers and file clerks to doctors, lawyers, university professors, Governors, and department heads. Once it has been accepted that the white-collar work force in a particular office or department is to be integrated, it appears to be a matter of indifference whether the first black will come in at the $5,000 or the $15,000 level. A lawyer or a file clerk, a stenographer or an engineer—it is simply a question of which vacancy first finds a qualified black applicant. But if the position involves supervision, regardless of level, then there remains a further barrier to be overcome, whether the position is head of a typing pool or director of a bureau.

What we have, then, is a system of three barriers: (1) In the blue-collar category, a barrier to entry at or promotion to the skilled level; (2) in the white-collar category, a barrier to entry; and (3) a further barrier to supervisory positions which becomes operative only when the entry barrier has been breached. Most data, if relevant at all, permit classification consistent with barriers (1) and (2). In some cases, professional and supervisory personnel are combined in such a way that the third barrier cannot be identified. In each case, we have combined categories not pertinent to these barriers and preserved as many pertinent categories as were available.

The other classification decision concerned degree of integration and, specifically, the location of the line between "token integration" and "integration."

As has already been noted, token integration is defined here not by motive, but by relative numbers. The same is true of nonintegration. A given government department may have no policy of discrimination, may always employ the best qualified applicant without regard to race, and still have an all-white staff. If so. it is not an integrated department, regardless of the good intentions of its supervisors. If the same department, applying its policy of nondiscrimination, has employed one Negro in a nontraditional Negro job, in a total staff of 50, this is token integration for our purposes.

Unquestionably, this treatment will appear unjust, particularly to department heads who earnestly desire to employ more Negroes, but have been unable to do so because of a lack of qualified applicants. There are, however, decisive reasons for its adoption. One is that it is impossible to assess motivation with the tools available to this study. Virtually all public officials nowadays state, if questioned, that they do not practice discrimination in employment. It is safe to assume that some mean what they say, some erroneously believe they mean what they say, and others know they do not mean what they say; but we have no means of distinguishing among them except by the results of their hiring policies. The other reason is that it is now clear that the achievement of equal employment opportunities requires more than sitting in a personnel office waiting for qualified Negro applicants. It requires a positive action program which includes examining job qualifications for relevance, greater reliance on on-the-job training, and going out to look for applicants. Without some or all of these elements, even an ideal nondiscriminatory policy will result in no integration or token integration at most.

But while it is easy enough to decide that token integration must be defined numerically, implementing this decision is far from simple. The phrases "one black in each office" and "one Negro in a nontraditional Negro job, in a total staff of 50" merely convey the idea of token integration; they are not satisfactory statistical standards. There is a particular significance to there being just one black in an office, whether the total staff is five or 500. But integration may also be at the token level when there are two or three or 10 or 20 blacks, if the office and the available reservoir of potential black employees are both large enough.

It is reasonable to assume that if, over a period of several generations, there had been no discrimination based on color in housing, jobs, education, political participation, etc., Negroes would be found in public employment approximately in proportion to their share of the population. But Negroes have not had the opportunity to develop either the skills or the aspirations that lead to careers in government, so that even a positive and determined effort to achieve full integration in public employment would not produce as large a proportion of blacks in government jobs as in the population. Comparison with the black proportion of the population cannot, therefore, be used to develop an index of token integration.

The proportion of college graduates who are black is everywhere substantially smaller than the black proportion of total population. Among the States under consideration, the former as a percent of the latter ranged, in 1960, from 60 percent for Oklahoma down to 27 percent for Mississippi, where 42.3 percent of the population but only 11.4 percent of the college graduates were black. Since college graduates have obviously overcome the consequences of cultural and social deprivation at least to an extent sufficient to open up the possibility of government employment in nontraditional jobs, it

would be reasonable to employ this proportion in developing a working definition of token integration for the white-collar category. Where the proportion of Negroes employed in a category is greater than zero but significantly less than their proportion of total college graduates in the State, token integration exists.

This is not a perfect standard, since many white-collar jobs in government do not call for a college degree, and many others require more education; but it has several advantages over other possible standards. (1) It is functionally related, although not perfectly so, to the unknown variable which it represents, namely the proportion of blacks among the people available for white-collar positions in government. (2) It reflects simultaneously both the proportion of blacks in the total population and the extent to which they have been culturally deprived. (3) It is a conservative standard, in that it does not preclude allegations of "tokenism" in cases where there is in fact significant doubt. And (4) it provides a "natural" basis for distinctions, since it tends to fall where there is a gap in the distribution of agencies by proportion of black employees. This last-named quality makes it relatively easy to define "significantly less" in the above stated criterion. One-half the proportion of blacks among the State's college graduates has been used in this study, but if it had been two-thirds or one-third, the result would have been closely similar. If an agency does not employ relatively as many blacks as there are in the population of college graduates, it typically does not come close. It is this fact which gives token integration reality.

It would seem a logical extension to measure token integration among skilled blue-collar workers by using the proportion of high school graduates who are black as a yardstick. The data initially do not appear to make sense. *A priori,* fewer Negroes would be expected among college graduates than among high school graduates with no further education, but in fact the opposite appears to be the case. In the deep South, particularly, if a Negro finishes high school, he is much more likely to go on through college than is a white high school graduate. There are a number of possible explanations for this. A greater commitment to education may be required to get a black through high school; or more good jobs may be open to white high school graduates, e.g., in the skilled trades. Whatever the reason, using the black proportion of high school graduates as a standard sets a lower limit for token integration among skilled blue-collar workers than among white-collar workers in 8 of the 13 Southern States. In Mississippi, for example, 11.4 percent of the college graduates, but only 8.8 percent of the high school graduates, are black. Using the 50-percent standard, a Mississippi government agency with blacks in 5.8 percent of its white-collar jobs would be judged to have gone beyond token integration, but would need blacks in only 4.5 percent of its skilled blue-collar jobs to earn the same judgment. This conflicts with our *a priori* expectation, but it is not on that account necessarily wrong.

Fortunately, the discrepancy, while intriguing, is small, and insignificant in relation to disparities in employment practices. The proportion of skilled workers who are black tends in practice to be either far above or far below the standard, so that beyond a point the refinement of the definition of the standard is without utility. For present purposes, token integration among skilled blue-collar workers is defined as existing when the proportion of skilled workers who are black is greater than zero but not greater than one-half the proportion of high school graduates who are black. Any cases where the use of the standard employed for white-collar workers would have resulted in a different classification will be discussed separately.

Still a third standard is needed for those cases where it is possible to distinguish supervisory from other white-collar employees. Here, the appropriate yardstick would seem to be the proportion of total employees who are black, with the same 50-percent allowance for normal variance. But in some circumstances this standard could disguise segregation as integration. That is, an agency might employ a large number of black workers in traditional, unskilled Negro jobs, and precisely because no whites were employed in these same jobs, might have black supervisors over them. If the ratio of supervisors to workers in this segregated black section of the agency were equal to at least half the ratio of supervisors to employees for the agency as a whole, it would then appear that integration of the supervisory function had surpassed the token level, when in fact there had been none at all. In practice, however, if data are available in sufficient detail to permit identification of supervisory employees, they also permit guarding against this sort of spurious conclusion. The standard will be as indicated, therefore, with separate discussion of any exceptional cases.

In all three cases, token integration will be presumed when there is only one Negro in a category, regardless of his proportion of the total.

II. STATE GOVERNMENTS

North Carolina

Among the States dealt with in this study, only North Carolina makes available reasonably complete data on employment in State government by race, occupation, and agency. Because of this, it is necessary to derive certain inferences from the North Carolina data where there are gaps in the data from other States. This consideration dictates that North Carolina be discussed first.

There is, however, one flaw in the North Carolina data. In 10 of our 13 States, the distinction between the Bureau of the Census' "color" category of "nonwhite" and its "race" category of "Negro" is insignificant. In North Carolina, on the other hand, there are about 41,000 Indians, constituting some 3½ percent of the "nonwhites." The terminology employed in the North Carolina State government report on employment is inconsistent, referring sometimes to "Negroes," sometimes to "Negroes and Indians," and sometimes to "nonwhites." It is evident, however, that the data are for "nonwhites" and include whatever Indians may be employed by the State. It is not known whether Indians in North Carolina tend to apply for State employment to a greater or lesser extent than do Negroes. It is possible that the numbers involved are small. About 1 percent of all residents of North Carolina are in State employment. If the same factor applies to Indians, there are only about 400 of them distributed among the 106 government agencies. In some cases, however, we are dealing with small numbers, and the unsuspected presence of an Indian or two could result in the faulty classification of an agency. There is no practical way of correcting this defect, but the reader is warned of it.

North Carolina is one of the States whose governments have made an effort to purge themselves of job discrimination. In January 1963, then Governor Terry Sanford created the North Carolina Good Neighbor Council, with the purpose, among others, of encouraging the employment of qualified persons without regard to race. At the same time, he stated the policy that "there will not be any discrimination in State jobs" and directed agency heads to implement this policy. In 1967 the State legislature gave statutory recognition to the Good Neighbor Council, which had previously existed only by executive order. Governor Dan K. Moore also continued his predecessor's policy of providing support and leadership to the movement for nondiscrimination. The climate has thus been relatively favorable, and it would be expected that North Carolina would serve as an example of what could be achieved under optimal conditions. If so, the outlook for the other States is not very bright.

About 25 percent of North Carolina's residents, but only about 17 percent of its State employees, are Negro. Among the whites in State employment, 68 percent are skilled labor or white-collar workers, compared with 30 percent of the Negroes. It is not clear whether this latter figure, which pertains to 1968, represents an improvement over the situation in 1964, when the first survey was undertaken. It is a slightly larger percentage of a significantly larger total, but the increase is compounded of a larger increase at the clerical and semiprofessional levels and a small decrease at the professional and managerial levels. Apparently the latter decrease is associated with the desegregation of facilities, particularly in the health and education fields. Among skilled workers, blacks have increased from 2.8 percent in 1964 to 5.2 percent in 1968. This is an impressive increase in percentage terms, but small in absolute numbers: there were still only 196 black skilled workers in the entire State government, and three-eighths of them were still employed at predominantly Negro facilities.

TABLE 1. NORTH CAROLINA STATE GOVERNMENT: RACIAL PATTERN OF EMPLOYMENT BY CATEGORY OF AGENCY; SKILLED LABOR, JULY 1, 1968

Category of agency	Agencies		Total employment		Black employment		Other employment		Total skilled employment		Black skilled employment		Other skilled employment	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No skilled labor	53	50.0	4,688	9.5	395	4.7	4,293	10.5	–	–	–	–	–	–
Educational institutions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	–	–	–	–	–	–
Medical institutions	2	1.9	54	.1	12	.1	42	.1	–	–	–	–	–	–
Other	51	43.1	4,634	9.4	383	4.5	4,251	10.4	–	–	–	–	–	–
Other, no black skilled labor	24	22.6	13,234	26.8	1,042	12.4	12,192	29.8	578	15.3	–	–	578	16.2
Educational institutions	6	5.7	1,345	2.7	68	.8	1,277	3.1	58	1.5	–	–	58	1.6
Medical institutions	7	6.6	3,701	7.5	612	7.3	3,089	7.6	167	4.4	–	–	167	4.7
Other	11	10.4	8,188	16.6	362	4.3	7,826	19.1	353	9.4	–	–	353	9.9
One black skilled worker each	6	5.7	2,079	4.2	189	2.2	1,890	4.6	54	1.4	6	3.1	48	1.3
Educational institutions	2	1.9	811	1.6	111	1.3	700	1.7	30	0.8	2	1.0	28	.8
Medical institutions	1	.9	26	.1	9	.1	17	0	1	0	1	.5	0	0
Other	3	2.8	1,242	2.5	69	.8	1,173	2.9	23	0.6	3	1.5	20	.6
Other, with less than 5 percent of skilled labor black	1	.9	10,589	21.5	388	4.6	10,201	25.0	2,201	58.4	7	3.6	2,194	61.4
Educational institutions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medical institutions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	1	.9	10,589	21.5	388	4.6	10,201	25.0	2,201	58.4	7	3.6	2,194	61.4
Predominantly black institutions	10	9.4	4,137	8.4	3,137	37.2	1,000	2.4	153	4.1	74	37.8	79	2.2
Educational institutions	6	5.7	1,861	3.8	1,616	19.2	245	.6	69	1.8	57	29.1	12	.3
Medical institutions	4	3.8	2,276	4.6	1,521	18.1	755	1.8	84	2.2	17	8.7	67	1.9
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE 1. NORTH CAROLINA STATE GOVERNMENT: RACIAL PATTERN OF EMPLOYMENT BY CATEGORY OF AGENCY; SKILLED LABOR, JULY 1, 1968—(Continued)

Category of Agency	Agencies		Total employment		Black employment		Other employment		Total skilled employment		Black skilled employment		Other skilled employment	
All other	12	11.3	14,569	29.6	3,272	38.8	11,297	27.6	783	20.8	109	55.6	674	18.9
Educational institutions	5	4.7	10,678	21.7	2,236	26.5	8,442	20.7	494	13.1	45	23.0	449	12.6
Medical institutions	3	2.8	2,336	4.7	458	5.4	1,878	4.6	124	3.3	9	4.6	115	3.2
Other	4	3.8	1,555	3.2	578	6.9	977	2.4	165	4.4	55	28.1	110	3.2
Total	106	100.0	49,296	100.0	8,423	100.0	40,873	100.0	3,769	100.0	196	100.0	3,573	100.0
Educational institutions	19	17.9	14,695	29.8	4,031	47.9	10,664	26.1	651	17.3	104	53.1	547	15.3
Medical institutions	17	16.0	8,393	17.0	2,612	31.0	5,781	14.1	376	10.0	27	13.8	349	9.8
Other	70	66.0	26,208	53.2	1,780	21.1	24,428	59.8	2,742	72.8	65	33.2	2,677	74.9

SOURCE: Computed from data in *Employment in State Government* (Raleigh, N.C., The North Carolina Good Neighbor Council, October 1968).

The real story of what is going on in North Carolina State employment, however, is revealed only by an agency-by-agency examination. The overall picture, for example, suggests slightly better than token integration at the skilled labor level: 5.2 percent is barely more than half the proportion of high school graduates in the State who are black, which is 9.9 percent. In fact, however, when one speaks of skilled labor in connection with State employment, one is speaking primarily of the Highway Department, which in North Carolina accounts for 58 percent of all jobs in this category. Discrimination could be wiped out completely in the other 105 agencies and institutions without significantly affecting employment opportunities for skilled black workmen. In fact, the 105 drew 12 percent of their skilled workers from the Negro community. If the Highway Department were to do the same, however, the number would more than double. The Department employed 2,201 skilled workers, of whom seven, or 0.3 percent, were black; at the average for the rest of the State government, this would increase to 264.

The picture for 1968 is shown in table 1, where agencies are grouped by situations and practices affecting black skilled labor, e.g., the first group of 52 agencies employed no skilled labor of any kind, the second, consisting of 24 agencies, employed 578 skilled laborers, none of whom was black, etc. Percentages refer to column totals, e.g., the 2,201 skilled laborers employed by the one agency in the fourth group (the Highway Department) were 58.4 percent of all skilled laborers employed by the State, while the seven skilled blacks in the Department were 3.6 percent of all skilled blacks employed by the State. The sixth and last group, "all other," consists of the 12 agencies which apparently did not discriminate by color in their employment of skilled labor. They are four universities and a college, three health facilities, the Board of Juvenile Corrections, and three smaller agencies.

White-collar employees, black and white, are much more numerous than skilled blue-collar workers in State government. More than half of all State employees were in this category, and 8.8 percent of them were black. Twelve percent of the State's college graduates were black, making 6.0 percent the dividing line for token integration at the white-collar level. The overall picture thus looks good.

As table 2 shows, however, this appearance of substantially better than token integration again fails to survive an agency-by-agency analysis. Half of the blacks in white-collar jobs were in segregated (i.e., predominantly black) schools and medical facilities; and even there, only nine of the 37 "high level supervisors, administrators, and directors" were black.

The "supervisory" category must be used with caution, as it is likely to have a different definition in each jurisdiction where it is employed. The definition of the North Carolina researchers is highly exclusive, as shown by the fact that there are 35 agencies in the State which had no "supervisory" employees at all. Probably many people having some function of supervision are classified as "professionals"; many others are in the "unclassified" civil service category, which includes both political appointees (such as most agency heads) and college faculty members. Nevertheless, there is no evidence that in North Carolina "supervisory" is applied inconsistently between blacks and whites.

By the North Carolina standard, there is only one unsegregated State agency or institution which was fully integrated at the white-collar and supervisory levels. This is Pembroke State College, with total employment of only 203, 19 percent of its white-collar employment black and two blacks among its four "supervisors."

Sixteen others had more than token integration at the white-collar level, but not at the supervisory level. Most of these are small—the exceptions are the University of North Carolina, the Agricultural Extension Service, and the Board of Juvenile Corrections, which among them employ 697 blacks as white-collar workers. None of these three represents a response to the Governor's initiative or the work of the Good Neighbor Council. The university has led rather than followed official policy; the other two also have long been important employers of Negroes—their percentages of black employees actually declined from 1964 to1968—and the jobs involved are mainly examples of new traditional Negro jobs rather than of genuine integration. The Extension Service employed a large number of black women as home demonstration agents to visit black homes; the Board of Juvenile Corrections served a clientele (youth who are in trouble with the law) among whom the poor, and hence the black, were well represented. This certainly indicates a more enlightened policy than hiring only white demonstration agents and letting black juvenile offenders identify authority exclusively with white skin. But it is not equal employment opportunity: it makes race a criterion for employment. In some agencies, a genuine conversion has taken place. The Personnel Department, for example, as recently as 1966 had no black employees; by 1968 it had four, three professional and one clerical, constituting 7.4 percent of its entire white-collar force of 54. This is not without significance, but it certainly lacks impact.

As with skilled labor, the meaningful elimination of discrimination against blacks in the hiring of white-collar workers requires cracking the few really large agencies. Of these, in 1968 only the university had an integrated

TABLE 2. NORTH CAROLINA STATE GOVERNMENT: RACIAL PATTERN OF EMPLOYMENT BY CATEGORY OF AGENCY: WHITE-COLLAR AND SUPERVISORY EMPLOYEES, JULY 1 1968

Category of agency	Agencies		Total employment		Black employment		White-collar employment		Blacks in white-collar jobs		Supervisory employment		Blacks in supervisory jobs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No blacks in white-collar jobs	39	36.8	2,207	4.5	104	1.2	1,479	5.6	0	0	30	3.0	0	0
No black employees	28	26.4	1,161	2.4	0	0	880	3.3	0	0	20	2.0	0	0
Other	11	10.4	1,046	2.1	104	1.2	599	2.3	0	0	10	1.0	0	0
One black in a white-collar job	13	12.3	757	1.4	59	.7	671	2.5	13	.6	27	2.7	0	0
Other, with less than 6 percent of white-collar labor black	27	25.5	31,393	63.7	2,808	33.3	15,952	60.4	316	13.6	749	74.9	16	48.5
No black supervisors	25	23.6	29,497	59.8	2,731	32.4	14,460	54.7	250	10.7	438	43.8	0	0
One black supervisor	1	.9	719	1.5	16	.2	332	1.3	9	.4	26	2.6	1	3.0
Other	1	.9	1,177	2.4	61	.7	1,160	4.4	57	2.5	285	28.5	15	45.5
Predominantly black institutions	10	9.4	4,137	8.4	3,137	37.2	1,781	6.7	1,171	50.3	37	3.7	9	27.3
No black supervisors	5	4.7	1,585	3.2	1,238	14.7	858	3.2	570	24.5	14	1.4	0	0
One black supervisor	2	1.9	799	1.6	601	7.1	280	1.1	194	8.3	5	.5	2	6.1
Other, token number black supervisors	1	.9	1,139	2.3	738	8.6	212	.8	27	1.2	13	1.3	2	6.1
Other	2	1.9	614	1.2	560	6.6	431	1.6	380	16.3	5	.5	5	15.2
Other	17	16.0	10,802	21.9	2,315	27.5	6,547	24.8	826	35.5	157	15.7	8	24.2
No black supervisors	14	13.2	4,771	9.7	663	7.9	2,260	8.6	423	13.9	70	7.0	0	0
Token number black supervisors	2	1.9	5,828	11.8	1,582	18.8	4,129	15.6	473	20.3	83	8.3	6	18.2
Other	1	.9	203	.4	70	.8	158	.6	30	1.3	4	.4	2	6.1
Total	106	100.0	49,296	100.0	8,423	100.0	26,430	100.0	2,326	100.0	1,000	100.0	33	100.0
No black supervisors	96	90.6	38,817	78.7	4,795	56.9	19,728	74.6	1,156	49.7	579	57.9	0	0
One black supervisor	3	2.8	1,518	3.1	617	7.3	612	2.3	203	8.7	31	3.1	3	9.1
Other, token number black supervisors	3	2.8	6,967	14.1	2,320	27.5	4,341	16.4	500	21.5	96	9.6	8	24.2
Other	4	3.8	1,994	4.0	691	8.2	1,749	6.6	467	20.1	294	29.4	22	66.7

SOURCE: Computed from data in *Employment in State Government* (Raleigh, N.C., The North Carolina Good Neighbor Council, October 1968).

white-collar work force, and even there it did not extend to the supervisory level. Token integration on the other hand, is widespread in the State government. The 24 agencies with all-white skilled labor employed only 15.3 percent of the State's skilled work force, while the 39 with no black employees in the white-collar category employed only 5.6 percent of the white-collar work force.

We are left, then, with the conclusion that a prolonged, determined, and energetic program, emanating from the Governor's office, to equalize employment opportunities, may be tremendously effective in bringing about token integration. There is no evidence in North Carolina, however, that it has the capability of producing full integration.

Kentucky

The basic data for Kentucky are contained in the report of the State Commission on Human Rights. The existence of such an agency, with adequate authority and resources to prepare and publish such a report, suggests, as in the case of North Carolina, a will on the part of the State government to eliminate discrimination based on race. Kentucky is also the most northern of the 13 States, and is one of only two which were not part of the Confederacy during the Civil War. We should expect it, therefore, to set a high standard. There is one serious flaw in the Kentucky data, however: They do not include total employees by occupational level. For each agency, we know the number of Negro employees who are unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, clerical, professional, or supervisory, and the total number of employees; but efforts to obtain a breakdown of the latter figure into the same six classifications have been unsuccessful. The most complete data available to us are those for North Carolina, and we have accordingly used the latter, where necessary, to estimate such information as, e.g., the number of skilled workers employed by the Kentucky State Highway Department.

There are 49 "agencies" in the Kentucky State government, as reported by the Commission on Human Rights. These include 40 departments, offices, and bureaus, four commissions, three boards, and two basket categories — "other commissions" (including the Human Rights Commission) and "other boards." In November 1967, these agencies employed 26,708 people, of whom 1,408 or 5.27 percent were black. This is not a particularly impressive total. In 1960, some 7.2 percent of Kentucky's population was nonwhite; and in the Louisville, Lexington, and Frankfort areas, where two-thirds of the State's Negro employees are found, the proportion was 12.1 percent. Frankfort, the State capital, is also the seat of Kentucky State College, a predominantly Negro institution and a potential source of government employees. The picture is even less impressive when it is noted that 1,010 of the 1,408 Negroes (70 percent) were employed as unskilled or semiskilled labor. The corresponding proportion of total employees is not known, but in general the work of State governments is not conducted primarily by unskilled and semiskilled labor. In Tennessee, only 26.7 percent of all State jobs outside of educational institutions were at this level; in North Carolina, the corresponding figure was 17 percent. Our concern in Kentucky, however, is primarily with the 398, or 30 percent, who held jobs as skilled labor (89) or at the clerical (128), professional (167), and supervisory (14) levels. The elimination of job discrimination will not create additional employment opportunities for Negroes as janitors, maids, and orderlies, its traces must rather be sought among the skilled and the white-collar workers.

Of Kentucky's 49 State agencies, nine had no black employees at all in 1967, and eight more had none except at the unskilled (a total of 24 employees) and semiskilled (a total of 2) levels. Most of these are very small, but they include the Department of Parks, with 1,346 employees, including one Negro in a semiskilled capacity, 12 as unskilled labor, and 1,333 whites. The Department of Agriculture, with 268 employees, is also in this category: it employs only three Negroes, all as unskilled labor. The Department of Military Affairs, with 143 employees, has four Negroes at the unskilled level. The remaining 14 agencies in this "no integration" category accounted for a total of only 323 employees, bringing the total for the category to 2,980, or 7.8 percent of the State government's workers.

An additional 15 agencies, while having some integration among white-collar employees, appeared to have no integration at the skilled labor level. There is some question about this because some State agencies employ little or no skilled labor at all, and the Kentucky data do not permit their unconditional identification. These 15 agencies, at least, employed no black skilled labor. The largest of them, the Department of Corrections, is one which elsewhere does have a significant place for skilled labor: 5 percent of the Corrections employees in North Carolina, for example, are in that category. With total employment of 752 in Kentucky, it might thus have 35 to 40 skilled labor jobs, none of them filled by blacks. The second largest agency in this group is Revenue, with 670 employees, of whom probably an insignificant number are skilled labor. Total employment in this group is 2,506. Together with the previous category, this means that 65 percent of all Kentucky State government

agencies, which employed 17 percent of all State employees, employed no Negroes as skilled labor.

At the time of the 1960 census, 5.2 percent of those Kentuckians who had completed high school only were "nonwhite." Our standard for the identification of token integration at the skilled labor level is, therefore, one black skilled worker, or a larger number constituting not more than 2.6 percent of the agency's estimated skilled labor requirements. The rule of one gives us six agencies as practicing token integration at this level: Public Safety, with 1,057 employees, of whom presumably at least 50 were skilled workers; Conservation, with 319 employees, at least 15 of whom were probably skilled workers; and four other agencies with total employment of only 351, of whom the four blacks may have been the only skilled workers. One other agency practices token integration at this level by the percentage rule: the Highway Department, with 8,819 employees, of whom probably at least 1,800 were skilled workers, had only eight Negroes at this level, less than 0.5 percent.

There are eight other agencies which employ very small numbers of black skilled workers (from two to six, for a total of 24), but whose total skilled labor requirements were estimated to be so low that these numbers place them well above the level of token integration. We are left, then, with two agencies employing 51 black skilled workers, 57 percent of the total. These agencies are the Department of Mental Health and the Tuberculosis Commission, both of which operate public hospitals. Mental Health employed 3,344 people, of whom perhaps 140 were skilled workers. Thirty-eight of the latter, or about 27 percent, were black. The Tuberculosis Commission employed 741 people, of whom perhaps 30 were skilled workers; 13 of the latter, or about 43 percent, were black.

There are many more white-collar jobs than skilled labor jobs in State government, both in general and for Kentucky Negroes. Tennessee figures show 65 percent of all State employees outside of educational institutions in "clerical, semiprofessional, and professional" jobs. These categories include all but "unskilled, semiskilled, and technical and skilled" jobs. In North Carolina, 44 percent of all State employees outside of educational institutions are in "professional, semiprofessional, managerial and office, clerical and kindred, and nonclassified," a grouping which excludes "domestic service, personal service, protective service, building service workers and porters, agriculture, fishery, and forest, skilled, semiskilled, unskilled, and uncertain." Among Negroes in Kentucky State government employment, those classified as "clerical, professional, and supervisory" totaled 309, or 22 percent.

In addition to the 17 agencies which had no black employees other than at the unskilled and semiskilled levels, there were five others which had no integration among white-collar employees. The largest of these were Conservation, and Fish and Wildlife with 319 and 297 employees, respectively. In discussing skilled labor, a rather arbitrary distinction was made between these agencies, in that Conservation, with one black skilled worker, was charged with token integration, while Fish and Wildlife, with two, was exonerated. The facts are, of course, that (1) neither department has employed any significant number of blacks at any level; (2) neither department could do much at the skilled labor level if it wanted to; (3) meaningful integration is possible and has not taken place at the so-called white-collar level; and (4) any system of classification makes some arbitrary and meaningless distinctions among some borderline cases. The other three agencies having black employees as skilled labor but not as white-collar workers were: the Attorney General's office with 29 employees; the Court of Appeals, with 121; and the Office of Legislative Research, with 46. Each of these employed one skilled black worker, and the Court of Appeals also employed a Negro as unskilled labor. In all, the category of "no integration" at the white-collar level included 45 percent of the agencies, but typically these were the smaller agencies, and their total employment was only 10.8 percent of the State total. The exception is the Department of Parks, which accounted for almost half the employment in this category.

Token employment at the white-collar level would consist in employing only one Negro as a clerical, professional, or supervisory employee, or in employing a number greater than one but amounting to not more than 1.85 percent of all white-collar employees in the agency. The latter rather modest figure is derived from the census datum that 3.7 percent of college graduates in Kentucky in 1960 were nonwhite. As with skilled labor, total white-collar employment by agency is estimated, where necessary, from North Carolina data.

By the rule of one, there are seven agencies which practice token integration at the white-collar level. Their total employment was 1,185 (including 105 Negroes), of which 741 (63 percent) were accounted for by the Tuberculosis Commission (which employed 87 of the Negroes). The Tuberculosis Commission's one black in a white-collar job was at the professional level, as was the Alcoholic Beverage Commission's. Four others were classified as clerical employees. In the remaining case, the Commerce Department, with 155 employees, had only one black employee, a woman, and she was employed in a supervisory capacity. Whether this is called token integration or something else, it is obviously a very special case.

By the percentage rule, five other agencies practice token integration among white-collar workers. All of these are relatively large: their total employment was 12,068, or 45 percent of all State employees. The Highway Department, with 8,819 employees, is the giant of them all. Applying the North Carolina ratio, the Kentucky Highway Department should have about 2,769 white-collar employees, 1.85 percent of which number would be 51. That is, if the Highway Department employed as many as 51 Negroes in white-collar positions, but no more, it would be practicing token integration by our standards. In fact, it employed 12. The Department of Public Safety, with 1,057 employees, would be practicing token integration if it had no more than 12 Negroes in white-collar positions: it actually had seven. The Department of Health (770 employees) needed more than 14 to move out of this category: it had eight. The Department of Revenue, with 670 employees, had 10 Negroes in white-collar jobs: three more would have taken it out of the token integration class. The Department of Corrections, with 752 employees, had only two Negroes in white-collar jobs, about 1.3 percent of total estimated white-collar employment.

Another nine agencies employed very small numbers of Negroes in white-collar jobs, but because of their small size the degree of integration was more than token. In all, these nine (which include "other boards") had 845 employees, of whom 26 were blacks, in white-collar jobs.

This leaves six agencies each employing 10 or more Negroes in white-collar jobs in which integration was above the token level. One of these is the category "other commissions," which, as was noted above, includes the Human Rights Commission itself. The others are the Economic Security Office, the Department of Education, the Department of Mental Health, the Child Welfare Department, and the Finance Department. Together, these agencies employed 9,672 people, or 36 percent of the State total, of whom 237 were Negroes, in white-collar jobs, which is 77 percent of the total. One hundred ninety-two of the latter, or 62 percent of the total, were employed in just three agencies: Economic Security, Education, and Mental Health.

Within the white-collar category, black supervisory employees numbered only 14 for the entire State. Three agencies employed one each, another three employed two each, and the remaining five were employed in Mental Health. These seven agencies together employed 70 percent (18,212) of all State employees and 76 percent (1,065) of black State employees.

The degree of integration among supervisory employees is relative to the number of Negroes employed in the agency. This means that an agency which has done a great deal to create employment opportunities for blacks must employ a large number of black supervisors to avoid the label of token integration at the supervisory level; on the other hand, little is expected at the supervisory level of an agency which has achieved little at other levels. This distinction is clearly evident in the comparison of the Highway Department with the Mental Health Department. Applying the North Carolina ratios, we estimate that the Highway Department had 36 supervisory employees and the Mental Health Department, 58. Only 1.1 percent of the Highway's total employment was black, so for parity there would need to be 1.1 percent of 36, or 0.4 black supervisor. The two actually employed, therefore, represent substantially more than token integration at the supervisory level. In Mental Health, on the other hand, 19 percent of employment was black, so that 11 black supervisors would be required for parity and 5.5 becomes the boundary line for token integration. The five actually employed, although close to this line, are clearly on the other side. The other two agencies having two black supervisory employees each are Employment Security and Education, and both of them were also well below the upper margin of token integration. In summary, there were 42 agencies with no integration at the supervisory level, six with token integration, employing 965 blacks of whom 12 were supervisors, and one with more than token integration, employing 100 blacks of whom two were supervisors.

The above discussion omits employment in State-operated educational institutions, which are the State's public colleges and universities. This is because they were omitted from the report of the Commission on Human Rights. It is clear from observation, however, that integration of the teaching and other white-collar and professional staff at such institutions has not proceeded beyond the token level.

Tennessee

The third State in our region for which there is an official State report covering Negro employment is Tennessee. The report is scarcely usable, providing very little detail and being based on a survey conducted in 1962. It does, however, constitute a basis for evaluating a 1967 survey of State government employment in Memphis. Memphis is not the capital, but it is by far the

largest city in Tennessee, and a significant number of State employees (994 in 1967) are employed there. Memphis is also the home of more than a third of the State's Negro population: 39 percent of its population is black, compared with 16 percent for the State as a whole. For these reasons, it would be expected that the integration of government jobs might have gone farther in Memphis than in the rest of the State; on the other hand, Memphis is a much more "southern" city than Nashville, the capital, which has about the same proportion of Negroes in its population. It is thus not clear whether, if the situation remained unchanged, the 1962 data for the State would show more or less integration than the 1967 data for the Memphis area. In fact, however, the situation ought not to have remained unchanged between 1962 and 1967, yet the data show very little progress. For the State, in 1962, 66.8 percent of all black State employees were in jobs below the level of skilled labor; in Memphis in 1967, the proportion was 60.3. In 1962, the Tennessee Council on Human Relations pointed out as "the single statistic which best symbolizes the extremely marginal position of the Negro worker in Tennessee State government" the fact that of about 3,500 clerical employees, only 17 were black. In Memphis in 1967, the State employed 213 clerical workers, of whom 26 were black. Blacks held 214 other white-collar jobs in 1962, 2.8 percent of the total; in Memphis in 1967, they held 105 of the 781 other white-collar jobs, or 13.4 percent. In 1962, they held 159, or about 11.1 percent of all skilled labor jobs; in Memphis in 1967, their 32 of the 108 total jobs at this level amounted to 29.6 percent. These are impressive signs of progress. The trouble is that they tend to disappear under closer examination.

There are 10 administrative departments of the Tennessee State government for which we have both 1962 and 1967 data. In 1962, they employed 522 Negroes in positions above unskilled labor, or 90 percent of all Negroes so employed; in Memphis in 1967, they employed 156 (95.7 percent). Of these totals, almost all were employed in agencies that dealt with Public Health (including Mental Health), Welfare, Corrections, and Employment Security. These are all fields in which the clientele is disproportionately black, and in which it is possible to insure that black professionals meet only with black clients. The concentration of blacks above unskilled in these fields was 87.2 percent in 1962; by 1967, in Memphis, it was 90.9 percent. Clearly what has happened in not that equal employment opportunities have become more widespread, but that those agencies which were already employing Negroes to a significant extent have increased their hiring.

Louisiana

Substantial coverage of State government employment is provided by the Civil Rights Commission's 1967 survey of government employment in a number of standard metropolitan statistical areas, where the SMSA includes the State capital. This is the case with Atlanta, Ga., and Baton Rouge, La. The State of Louisiana employed 5,662 people in 67 agencies, commissions, offices, departments, etc., in the Baton Rouge area. Only 197, or 3.5 percent, of these were black, although the population of the State is about 31 percent black, and the city of Baton Rouge about the same. Most of the 197, moreover, were laborers and service workers: only 23 of them were white-collar workers, and 22 were skilled laborers. Obviously, when these were divided up among 67 agencies, not much in the way of equal employment opportunity was to be found.

In fact, 46 agencies, employing 954 people, had no black employees at all. Most of these were very small; the largest is the Drivers License Division of the Department of Public Safety, with 156 employees in Baton Rouge. Another 11 agencies, with 2,548 employees, had no blacks in white-collar or skilled labor positions. These agencies employed only 24 blacks altogether, or less than 1 percent of total employment, and all 24 were unskilled laborers or service workers. Included in this group were the giant of all State agencies, the Highway Department, with 1,499 employees in Baton Rouge, six of them black, and three other agencies with employment over 100. These were the Department of Hospitals, with 145 employees, two black; the Greenwell Springs Tuberculosis Hospital, with 238 employees, one black; and the Casualty and Surety Commission, with 241 employees, one black. It will be noted that in other State governments the field of health and hospitals has been one of the leaders in opening nontraditional jobs to Negroes.

The remaining 10 agencies, with 2,160 employees, employed 173 of the 197 blacks, including all of the 45 in skilled and white-collar jobs. One hundred and eighteen of the blacks, including one white-collar and six skilled, were in one agency, the State Buildings Department. This is the agency which provides custodial service to the capital, and clearly these are traditional Negro jobs. The Office of Economic Opportunity set an example for other agencies, with 40 percent of its all white-collar staff being black; this was only two people, however, in a total of five. A couple of other agencies in the group were of comparable size: Surplus Property employed 17, six of them black, of whom five are skilled

laborers; and the Housing Authority for the Parish of East Baton Rouge employed six people, two of them black, of whom one is at the white-collar level. The Department of Administration appears to be a special case: it had 138 employees, four of them black, three of whom constitute its entire skilled labor complement. Presumably these are some sort of skilled jobs traditionally reserved for Negroes. The Revenue Department and the Agriculture Department were integrated at the one-black level: Revenue had three black employees in a total of 516, but one of the three is its only skilled laborer; Agriculture had six blacks in a total of 136, but one of the six was a white-collar worker. Two other agencies had integrated only to the token level. Employment Security had 373 employees, seven of them black, including four white-collar workers. This was 1.1 percent of total white-collar workers, in a State where in 1960, 10.7 percent of college graduates were black. The Welfare Department had 18 blacks among its 642 employees, not an impressive total, but they included eight white-collar workers and seven skilled laborers. The latter were 30.4 percent of all skilled workers in the Department, but the former were only 1.3 percent of the white-collar workers. The one remaining agency was the Louisiana State Library, with 61 employees, including seven blacks, six of whom were white-collar workers.

Only two Negroes held supervisory positions in State government in the Baton Rouge area. One was in the Office of Economic Opportunity; the other was the Minority Group Representative in Employment Security.

Georgia

Moving from Baton Rouge to Atlanta, one feels a change in the atmosphere. Atlanta is a large and cosmopolitan city, whose leaders personify the modern southern view that white is still beautiful, but that racism is bad for business. Government officials in Atlanta, when concerned with their public image, are careful to give verbal support to the idea of equal employment opportunities; in Baton Rouge, they are careful not to do so. To some extent, this difference is reflected in the 1967 employment. In Atlanta, there are a great many more black white-collar workers and a much smaller number of agencies which do not employ blacks. Of 29 agencies, etc., seven employed no Negroes at all and another four employed none in white-collar or skilled labor positions. All 11 of these, moreover, are small: their total employment in Atlanta was only 217. The 18 agencies which employed blacks as skilled labor (1) or white-collar workers (14) or both (3), had a total employment of 5,749 and included all those with 100 or more employees.

The differences between the two Deep South capitals are, however, less striking than the similarities. For one, in both States the total number of Negroes employed by the State is strikingly low. In North Carolina and Kentucky, the proportion of Negroes in State employment was about three-fourths their proportion in total population; in Tennessee in 1962, the corresponding ratio was slightly less than half, while in Memphis in 1967 it was three-fourths the proportion in the city's population and well in excess of the proportion in the State. Georgia is about 25 percent black and Atlanta 38 percent, yet only 5.7 percent of State employees in Atlanta were Negroes. This is better than the 3.5 percent in Baton Rouge, but definitely in that class.

Another similarity is that in both cases the Negroes in white-collar and skilled positions are highly concentrated in a very few agencies. This similarity is obscured by the fact that token integration is the rule in Atlanta and the exception in Baton Rouge; but for 13 of the 17 agencies employing blacks as white-collar workers in Atlanta, it is only a token. Nine of these employed one black each, and none of the nine employed any black skilled labor. Most of these are small agencies, but they include the Highway Department, with 1,867 employees, 1,358 white-collar and 210 skilled labor, and the Department of Public Safety, with 237 employees, 225 of them in the white-collar category. Four others employed more than one black each as white-collar workers, but at a rate less than 5 percent in a State in which 10 percent of college graduates are black. These include the Department of Revenue, with 1,019 employees, all but five white-collar, which employed 18 blacks at that level, or 1.8 percent, while all five of its unskilled laborers were black. The Department of Public Health is also in this group, with 725 employees, 681 at the white-collar level, of whom 15, or 2.2 percent, were black. This Department also employed most of the black skilled laborers in State employment in Atlanta: 23, or 70 percent of the agency's total. Two smaller departments, the Comptroller General and the Department of Veterans' Services, complete the token integration group; although the Department of Agriculture, with 11 blacks among its 219 white-collar employees, fell just over the 5 percent line. The Department of Family and Children's Service and the Department of Labor are the two major employers of blacks as white-collar workers, and both of these are also agencies in which black professionals were employed to deal with black clients (and black clerical workers to assist black professionals). The Department of Labor in Georgia consists largely of the employment security program.

What remains, then, is the Georgia Department of State, with 201 employees, 31 of them black, including 163 white-collar employees, 16 of them black.

Eighteen blacks were employed in Atlanta by State agencies at the supervisory level: 14 of these were in Family and Children's Service and three in Labor. The remaining one worked for the Department of Parks, where he was one of a total of two employees, both at the supervisory level. Whatever this represents, it manifestly has little numerical impact on equalizing employment opportunities.

Virginia

In August 1969, a group of civil rights leaders met with the Governor of Virginia to protest discrimination in State employment, which, on the basis of a study undertaken by the Virginia Council on Human Relations, they alleged to exist particularly in the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, the Department of Highways, the Division of Motor Vehicles, and the Department of State Police. To assist the Governor in replying to this protest, the State's director of personnel assembled data as of that month on State employment by agency, by race, and by job title. No analysis of these data is available, but the raw data, in the form of a computer printout, have been made available for the purposes of the present study.

There are approximately 1,956 occupational titles in Virginia State employment. In 1,539 of these, no Negroes were employed. An additional 140 were held by one black employee each. Forty-eight others are "traditional Negro jobs" by the evidence that they were held by more blacks than whites. This leaves 229, or 11.7 percent of all occupational titles, which appeared to be open to employees of all colors. About 40 percent of all black employees were in "traditional Negro jobs" as identified above: these were principally custodial workers, kitchen workers, and the lower echelons of hospital employees. About 30 percent of all white employees were in jobs which were either all white, or which had only one Negro in the classification. In only four fields are there occupations dominated by whites which employed as many as 100 Negroes: the clerk-typist field, mental hospitals, highways, and higher education.

There are 14 job classifications in the clerk-typist field, in all of which some Negroes were employed, over 100 each in two of them. What cannot be derived from the data is the extent to which black clerks and typists are working for black professional and supervisory personnel, although there are some indications that there may be a substantial number. The Employment Commission, for example, had four black employment office managers and four black clerk-stenographers. The Department of Education had a total of 26 black employees in the "white-collar, professional, and supervisory category": 13 had the word "supervisor" in their titles, and the other 13 were clerk-stenographers. Over half of the blacks in this line of work were employed in predominantly black institutions. In any case, the numbers are small on a proportionate basis. Of all white State employees, 16.8 percent were in the clerk-typist field; the 625 blacks in this field were only 8 percent of their total representation.

Mental hospital work, on the other hand, employs a disproportionately large number of Negroes. Unlike clerks and typists, of course, these employees are concentrated in a few agencies and institutions, and some much more precise observations can be made about them. Involved are the Department of Mental Hygiene and Hospitals and 10 institutions which it administers. Of these 10, three are predominantly black. Thirty percent of all black employees of the State of Virginia worked in this field, compared to 11 percent of white employees. The character of mental health work is quite different from that of State employment generally. There were, for example, 8,706 unskilled jobs in Virginia State government; 50.6 percent of these were in mental health. So many more of the total blacks were in unskilled jobs, however (45.2 percent, as compared with 17.2 percent of total employees), that their representation in mental health appears particularly heavy.

Highway work, in Virginia as elsewhere, is the largest employer in State government. This is particularly true of skilled labor. Of all the skilled labor employed in the State of Virginia, 54.1 percent worked in the Highway Department. Two hundred fifty-eight of them were black, which is 5.7 percent, or somewhat above the 4.5-percent limit for token integration. In total white-collar and supervisory employment, however, the Department has lagged far behind the State government as a whole in providing jobs for Negroes. Only 5 percent of its total employees were black, compared to 15.5 percent for the State. Among white-collar, professional, and supervisory personnel, only 0.8 percent were black, compared to 8.8 percent for the State. Because of its small proportion of black employees, any number of black supervisory employees in excess of 2.5 percent of the total would be considered better than token integration; in fact, however, only 0.4 percent of the Department's supervisory employees were black: four highway foremen out of 549, and one highway maintenance superintendent out of 275.

TABLE 3. VIRGINIA STATE GOVERNMENT: RACIAL PATTERN OF EMPLOYMENT BY CATEGORY OF AGENCY; SKILLED LABOR, AUGUST 1969

Category of agency	Agencies		Total employment		Black employment		Other employment		Total skilled employment		Black skilled employment		Other skilled employment	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No skilled labor	62	41.1	3,665	7.2	185	2.4	3,480	8.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
No black employees	45	29.8	1,383	2.7	0	0	1,383	3.2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	17	11.3	2,282	4.5	185	2.4	2,097	4.9	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other, no black skilled labor	37	24.5	8,694	17.2	635	8.1	8,059	18.8	551	6.6	0	0	551	7.3
No black employees	11	7.3	1,204	2.4	0	0	1,204	2.8	287	3.4	0	0	287	3.8
Other	26	17.2	7,490	14.8	635	8.0	6,855	16.0	264	3.2	0	0	264	3.5
One black skilled worker each	6	4.0	919	1.8	74	.9	845	2.0	25	.3	6	.7	19	.3
Other, with less than 4.5 percent of skilled labor black	3	2.0	3,550	7.0	32	.4	3,518	8.2	1,386	16.6	12	1.4	1,374	18.3
Predominantly black institutions	9	6.0	5,423	10.7	3,856	49.2	1,567	3.7	507	6.1	286	34.5	221	2.9
Other	34	22.5	28,381	56.1	3,060	39.0	25,321	59.2	5,858	70.3	525	63.3	5,333	71.1
With less than 50 skilled employees each	24	15.9	9,100	18.0	1,054	13.4	8,046	18.8	506	6.1	119	14.4	387	5.2
Other, with less than 200 skilled employees each	9	6.0	8,408	16.6	1,462	18.6	6,946	16.2	844	10.1	148	17.9	696	9.3
Other	1	.7	10,873	21.5	544	6.9	10,329	24.1	4,508	54.1	258	31.1	4,250	56.7
Total	151	100.0	50,632	100.0	7,842	100.0	42,790	100.0	8,327	100.0	829	100.0	7,498	100.0

SOURCE: Computed from data contained in computer printouts furnished by the Director of Personnel of the State of Virginia.

TABLE 4. VIRGINIA STATE GOVERNMENT: RACIAL PATTERN OF EMPLOYMENT BY CATEGORY OF AGENCY; WHITE-COLLAR AND SUPERVISORY EMPLOYEES, AUGUST 1969

Category of agency	Agencies		Total employment		Black employment		White-collar employment		Blacks in white-collar jobs		Supervisory employment		Blacks in supervisory jobs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No blacks in white-collar jobs	79	52.3	8,160	16.1	186	2.4	5,671	16.9	0	0	0	0	0	0
No black employees	56	37.1	2,587	5.1	0	0	2,283	6.8	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	23	15.2	5,573	11.0	186	2.4	3,388	10.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
One black in a white-collar job	13	8.6	1,809	3.6	158	2.0	1,402	4.2	13	.4	0	0	5	1.0
No black supervisors	8	5.3	1,231	2.4	84	1.1	1,071	3.2	8	.3	0	0	0	0
Other	5	3.3	578	1.1	74	.9	331	1.0	5	.2	69	1.5	5	1.0
Other, with less than 3.6 percent of white-collar labor black	21	13.9	23,399	46.2	1,699	21.7	13,754	40.9	277	8.0	0	0	55	11.0
No black supervisor	10	6.6	4,016	7.9	295	3.8	2,623	7.8	39	1.3	0	0	0	0
One black supervisor	4	2.6	3,808	7.5	175	2.2	2,113	6.3	54	1.8	279	6.2	4	.8
Other, token number black supervisors	2	1.3	11,130	22.0	645	8.2	5,395	16.1	43	1.5	1,314	29.0	7	1.4
Other	5	3.3	4,445	13.2	584	7.4	3,623	10.8	101	3.4	257	5.7	44	8.8
Predominantly black institutions	9	6.0	5,423	10.7	3,855	49.2	3,048	9.1	1,788	60.3	592	13.1	282	56.2
Token number black supervisors	1	.7	2,198	4.3	1,106	14.1	1,512	4.5	618	20.8	298	6.6	66	13.1
Other	8	5.3	3,225	6.4	2,750	35.1	1,536	4.6	1,170	39.5	294	6.5	216	43.0
Other	29	19.2	1,841	23.4	1,943	24.8	9,724	28.9	927	31.3	0	0	160	31.9
No black supervisors	5	3.3	997	2.0	103	1.3	986	2.9	102	3.4	0	0	0	0
Token number black supervisors	10	6.6	8,033	15.9	1,514	19.3	6,168	18.4	539	18.2	1,246	27.5	64	12.7
Other	14	9.3	2,811	5.5	326	4.2	2,570	7.6	286	9.6	775	17.1	96	19.1
Total	151	100.0	50,632	100.0	7,842	100.0	33,599	100.0	2,965	100.0	4,536	100.0	502	100.0
No black supervisors	102	67.5	14,384	28.4	668	8.5	10,351	30.8	149	5.0	0	0	0	0
One black supervisor	13	8.6	4,813	9.5	293	3.7	2,488	7.4	710	23.9	402	8.9	13	2.6
Other, token number black supervisors	9	6.0	20,934	41.3	3,221	41.1	12,865	38.3	1,188	40.1	2,808	61.9	133	26.5
Other	27	17.9	10,481	20.7	3,660	46.7	7,729	23.0	1,557	52.5	1,326	29.2	356	70.9

SOURCE: Computed from data contained in computer printouts furnished by the Director of Personnel of the State of Virginia.

The two occupations in higher education which, while dominated by whites, employed more than 100 blacks each were instructor and assistant professor. All but 15 of the instructors, and all but eight of the assistant professors, worked at the two predominantly black State colleges, Virginia State College and Norfolk State College.

An analysis of employing agencies rather than occupational categories as the basis for classifications is summarized in tables 3 and 4. For skilled labor (table 3), Virginia appears to be a State of extremes. Of the 80 agencies which employ some skilled labor and which are not predominantly black institutions, 37 employed no black skilled labor at all, while 34 others employed them, on the average, in exactly the same proportion (9 percent) that blacks are of total high school graduates. Only nine agencies practice token integration at the skilled level. Virginia is notable, moreover, because one of the 34 integrated agencies is the Highway Department, the major employer of skilled labor and elsewhere one of the last to integrate. The Department's 5.7-percent rate of integration of its skilled work force was not greatly above the arbitrary 4.5-percent rate for token integration, and it might be objected that this is an arbitrary classification. The difference between Virginia's 5.7 percent and North Carolina's 0.3 percent, however, is unquestionably real. The 5.7 percent were, moreover, employed across the whole spectrum of skilled occupations in the Department. The State Police had two blacks in skilled occupations, but one was a cook and the other a prison farm guard; there was not a single black State trooper. In Highways, on the other hand, blacks were highway equipment operators, members of survey teams, mechanics, and so on.

For white-collar and supervisory employees in Virginia, the situation is quite different, as shown in table 4. Of the blacks in these categories, 60.3 percent worked for the nine predominantly black State institutions. More than half of all agencies in the State employed no blacks at all at the white-collar level, while 34 others employed them only at token rates, including the Highway Department, with 0.8 percent integration of white-collar workers and 0.4 percent of supervisory employees. Of the 29 agencies which employed blacks at more than a token rate in white-collar jobs, 15 had either no black supervisory employees or only a token number. The latter group includes the Alcoholic Beverage Control Commission, the first agency singled out for attention by the Virginia Council on Human Relations. Its specific complaint was that blacks employed as porters who met the requirements for promotion to clerk were not promoted, or that if they were, they were transferred to stores serving predominantly black neighborhoods. The data tend to substantiate this charge. Of 354 black employees in the agency, 226 were in jobs exclusively or predominantly held by blacks: store porter, clerk assistant, warehouseman, and utility service foreman.

The remaining 14 agencies appear to be integrated at the white-collar and supervisory levels, with 11.1 percent black white-collar employees and 12.4 percent black supervisory employees. No doubt some of the latter were supervising only other blacks, but there are identifiable exceptions. The Virginia Treatment Center (a mental institution) had a black supervisor of nurses, although all nine subordinate nurses were white. The Reception and Diagnostic Center (a penal institution for juveniles) had a black child welfare supervisor, although 11 of the 13 subordinates were white, and a black assistant training school superintendent with only white teachers. Four of the 55 office managers of the Employment Commission were black. None of the agencies in this group is a major factor in the job market, however. The Employment Commission employed less than 100 blacks in all, and none of the rest employed more than 50. The major opportunities for progress remain in the agencies now practicing token integration.

Texas

At the request of the Texas State Senate, the Texas Legislative Council, a State agency, conducted a survey of "Employment in State Government by Ethnic Origin" in the winter of 1968-69. The data were collected in a form which makes it possible to distinguish unskilled, skilled, and white-collar workers, as per the usage of this report, but included supervisory workers in a category with "professional and technical" personnel. On the other hand, the Texas data include information on salary levels which is unavailable for other governments.

The information on skilled workers by agency is shown in table 5. Of 66 agencies which had skilled labor, 28 employed no blacks at this level, and two (which are predominantly black educational institutions) employed no whites. Another 18 practiced token integration in one form or the other: this group includes the Highway Department, which accounts for 42 percent of all skilled labor in Texas State government. More than half of all black skilled workers were employed in the remaining 18 agencies, which on the average had skilled labor forces which were 11.8 percent black; 6.7 percent of high school graduates in Texas are black, so this is well in excess of a token rate. A number of these are very small

TABLE 5. TEXAS STATE GOVERNMENT: RACIAL PATTERN OF EMPLOYMENT BY AGENCY: SKILLED LABOR, SEPTEMBER 30, 1968

Category of agency	Agencies		Black employment total		Other employment total		Black employment skilled		Other employment skilled		Total employment skilled	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No skilled labor	66	50.0	55	0.7	1,939	2.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Other, no black skilled labor	28	21.2	592	7.5	13,212	16.5	0	0	695	4.4	695	4.2
One black skilled worker	8	6.1	221	2.8	4,106	5.1	8	1.1	297	1.9	305	1.8
Other, with less than 3.5 percent of skilled workers black	10	7.6	961	12.2	29,151	36.5	255	33.7	11,863	74.4	12,118	72.6
Predominantly black institutions	2	1.5	892	11.3	92	.1	82	10.8	0	0	82	.5
All other	18	13.6	5,153	65.4	31,474	39.4	412	54.4	3,081	19.3	3,493	20.9
Total	132	100.0	7,874	99.9	79,974	100.0	757	100.0	15,936	100.0	16,693	100.0

SOURCE: Computed from data in Texas Legislative Council, *Employment in State Government* (Report No. 68-4), Austin, Texas, January 1969.

agencies, but 11 of them have been designated as significant, either because they have more than 100 skilled workers or because they are also integrated at the white-collar level. Additional data on these 11 are presented in table 7, below, and will be discussed in connection with that table.

Of the 132 State agencies, 74 employed no blacks at all as white-collar workers, and another 41 employed them only at a token rate (see table 6). Excluding the two predominantly black institutions, this leaves 15 which had fully integrated white-collar work forces. On the average, these 15 had 7.2 percent black employees at this level, more than the proportion (5.8 percent) of college graduates who are black. Again, a number of them are small, but 10 of them are considered significant, either because they were also integrated at the skilled level or because they employed more than 200 white-collar workers each.

The 11 "significant agencies appearing to be integrated" at the skilled level and the 10 at the white-collar level amount to a total of 14, allowing for duplications. A detailed analysis of relative salary levels, comparing blacks and "Anglos" (white persons not having Spanish surnames), is presented in table 7. The results are striking and suggest strongly that "full integration" is still a long way from equal employment opportunity. Twelve percent of the Anglo employees in the 14 agencies were in the three top salary categories, i.e., earned at least $12,000 annually; only 0.4 percent of the blacks had achieved this level. Only two of the agencies (both universities) had more than one black employee at a salary in this range, and seven had none at all. The same discrepancy persists as we move down the salary scale, with 43.2 percent of the Anglos, but only 8.3 percent of the blacks, having salaries above $6,407. These 14 agencies employed 1,326 blacks at the white-collar level, but only 426 blacks at salaries above $6,407. Obviously the integration is either limited largely to the lower echelons of white-collar jobs or does not involve equal pay for equal work.

When salary levels for the State as a whole (table 8) are considered, a picture of gross discrimination in terms of job quality as measured by salary emerges. Ninety-nine of 132 State agencies had no blacks at salaries above $8,075, although 38.4 percent of their Anglo employees were above this level. A handful of agencies, mainly educational institutions, had token numbers of blacks at salaries in the middle to upper range. Perhaps most significant is the observation that an absolute majority of the higher salaried blacks was found in the two

TABLE 6. TEXAS STATE GOVERNMENT: RACIAL PATTERN OF EMPLOYMENT BY AGENCY; WHITE-COLLAR WORKERS, SEPTEMBER 30, 1968

Category of agency	Agencies		Black employment total		Other employment total		Black employment white-collar		Other employment white-collar		Total employment white-collar	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No black employees	56	42.4	0	0.0	1,701	2.1	0	0.0	1,266	2.4	1,266	2.3
No black employees except unskilled	10	7.6	27	.3	948	1.2	0	0	775	1.5	775	1.4
Other, no black white-collar employees	8	6.1	186	2.4	2,080	2.6	0	0	1,436	2.8	1,436	2.6
One black white-collar employee	13	9.8	358	4.5	3,194	4.0	13	.6	2,281	4.4	2,294	4.2
Other, with less then 2.9 percent of white-collar employees black	28	21.2	2,254	28.6	47,106	58.9	337	15.6	30,864	59.2	31,201	57.5
Predominantly black institutions	2	1.5	892	11.3	92	.1	607	28.1	91	.2	698	1.3
Other, with more than 2.9 percent of white-collar employees black	15	11.4	4,157	52.8	24,853	31.1	1,202	55.7	15,400	29.6	16,602	30.6
Total	132	100.0	7,874	99.9	79,974	100.0	2,159	100.0	52,113	100.1	54,272	99.9

SOURCE: Computed from data in Texas Legislative Council, *Employment in State Government* (Report No. 60-4), Austin, Texas, January 1969.

TABLE 7. TEXAS STATE GOVERNMENT: SIGNIFICANT AGENCIES APPEARING TO BE INTEGRATED; NUMBER AND PERCENT OF ANGLOS AND NEGROES BY SALARY LEVEL AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 1968

Category and agency	Total number	Over $6,407		Over $8,075		Over $9,839		Over $11,999		Over $15,107		Over $20,000	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
More than token integration of both skilled and white-collar employees													
Department of Mental Health													
Anglo	8,746	1,145	13.1	810	9.3	483	5.5	295	3.4	162	1.9	33	0.4
Negro	1,470	31	2.1	19	1.3	5	.3	1	.1	1	.1	0	0
Texas Youth Council													
Anglo	1,100	250	22.7	100	9.1	25	2.3	9	.8	1	.1	0	0
Negro	144	30	20.8	5	3.5	1	.7	1	.7	0	0	0	0
Texas Education Agency													
Anglo	1,771	891	50.3	742	41.9	445	25.1	119	6.7	11	.6	2	.1
Negro	202	42	20.8	28	13.9	10	5.0	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE 7. TEXAS STATE GOVERNMENT: SIGNIFICANT AGENCIES APPEARING TO BE INTEGRATED: NUMBER AND PERCENT OF ANGLOS AND NEGROES BY SALARY LEVEL AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 1968—(Continued)

Category and agency	Total number	Over $6,407		Over $8,075		Over $9,839		Over $11,999		Over $15,107		Over $20,000	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
University of Texas, Medical Branch, Galveston													
Anglo	1,747	917	52.5	493	28.2	253	14.5	178	10.2	142	8.1	67	3.8
Negro	876	52	5.9	23	2.6	1	.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
University of Texas, Southwestern, Dallas													
Anglo	763	519	68.0	357	46.8	275	36.0	210	27.5	173	22.7	97	12.7
Negro	134	19	14.2	1	.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
University of Texas, Dental Branch													
Anglo	257	136	52.9	111	43.2	99	38.5	90	35.0	70	27.2	31	12.1
Negro	39	4	10.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
University of Texas, Medical Division, Anderson													
Anglo	1,352	790	58.4	427	31.6	257	19.0	198	14.6	135	10.0	91	6.7
Negro	650	50	7.7	17	2.6	2	.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
More than token integration of white-collar workers, more than 200 total white-collar workers													
Texas Employment Commission													
Anglo	2,616	1,844	70.5	875	33.4	341	13.0	75	2.9	23	0.9	3	.1
Negro	134	44	32.8	13	9.7	1	.7	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tuberculosis Hospital													
Anglo	2,383	971	40.7	610	25.5	359	15.0	184	7.7	90	3.8	33	1.4
Negro	371	22	5.9	9	2.4	4	1.1	1	.3	1	.3	0	0
Agricultural Extension Service													
Anglo	876	727	83.0	595	67.9	352	40.2	131	15.0	27	3.1	3	.3
Negro	106	98	92.5	62	58.5	15	14.2	1	.9	0	0	0	0
More than token integration of skilled employees, more than 100 total skilled employees													
Texas A & M University													
Anglo	3,554	1,993	56.1	1,631	45.9	1,352	38.0	1,000	28.1	594	16.7	174	5.0
Negro	466	14	3.0	9	1.9	9	1.9	6	1.3	3	.6	0	0
Forest Service													
Anglo	296	47	15.9	25	8.4	10	3.4	5	1.7	3	1.0	0	0
Negro	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
University of Texas, Austin													
Anglo	4,150	2,375	57.2	1,787	43.1	1,240	29.9	838	20.2	421	10.1	96	2.3
Negro	349	9	2.6	1	.3	1	.3	1	.3	0	0	0	0
University of Houston													
Anglo	1,810	960	53.0	792	43.8	634	35.0	435	24.0	185	10.2	55	3.0
Negro	155	11	7.1	6	3.9	6	3.9	3	1.9	1	.6	0	0
Totals, above 14 agencies													
Anglo	31,426	13,565	43.2	9,355	29.8	6,125	19.5	3,767	12.0	2,037	6.5	685	2.2
Negro	5,121	426	8.3	193	3.8	55	1.1	14	.3	6	.1	0	0

SOURCE: Computed from data in Texas Legislative Council, *Employment in State Government* (Report No. 60-4), Austin, Texas, January 1969.

TABLE 8. TEXAS STATE GOVERNMENT: NUMBER AND PERCENT OF ANGLOS AND NEGROES BY SALARY LEVEL AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 1968

Category and agency	Total number	Over $6,407		Over $8,075		Over $9,839		Over $11,999		Over $15,107		Over $20,000	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All agencies (132)													
Anglo	72,439	34,288	47.3	21,545	29.7	13,659	18.9	7,797	10.8	3,617	5.0	1,062	1.5
Negro	7,874	907	11.5	517	6.6	250	3.2	118	1.5	46	.6	6	.1
Predominantly black institutions (2)													
Anglo	63	54	85.7	27	42.9	10	15.9	5	7.9	0	0	0	0
Negro	892	408	45.7	303	34.0	187	21.0	97	10.9	39	4.4	6	.7
All other agencies (130)													
Anglo	72,376	34,234	47.3	21,516	29.7	13,649	18.9	7,792	10.8	3,617	5.0	1,062	1.5
Negro	6,982	499	7.1	214	3.1	63	.9	21	.3	7	.1	0	0
Agencies (14) appearing to be integrated													
Anglo	31,426	13,565	43.2	9,355	29.8	6,125	19.5	3,767	12.0	2,037	6.5	685	2.2
Negro	5,121	426	8.3	193	3.8	55	1.1	14	.3	6	.1	0	0
All other agencies (116)													
Anglo	40,950	20,669	50.5	12,163	29.7	7,524	18.4	4,025	9.8	1,580	3.9	377	.9
Negro	1,861	73	3.9	21	1.1	8	.4	7	.4	1	.1	0	0
Agencies of public education included in above 116 agencies, and employing Negroes at salaries above $6,407 (10)													
Anglo	4,978	3,072	61.7	2,519	50.6	1,900	38.2	1,056	21.3	364	7.3	76	1.5
Negro	809	13	1.6	9	1.1	7	.9	6	.7	1	.1	0	0
All other agencies (106)													
Anglo	35,972	17,597	48.9	9,644	26.8	5,624	15.6	2,969	8.3	1,216	3.4	301	.8
Negro	1,052	60	5.7	12	1.1	1	.1	1	.1	0	0	0	0
Attorney General, Public Welfare, Public Safety, Commission on Alcoholism, Highways, Corrections, Pardons and Paroles (7)													
Anglo	23,981	11,230	46.8	5,043	21.0	2,524	10.5	1,109	4.6	354	1.5	24	.1
Negro	499	48	9.6	12	2.4	1	.2	1	.2	0	0	0	0
All other agencies (99)													
Anglo	11,991	6,367	53.1	4,601	38.4	3,100	25.9	1,860	15.5	862	7.2	277	2.3
Negro	553	12	2.2	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0	0	0	0

SOURCE: Computed from data in Texas Legislative Council, *Employment in State Government* (Report No. 60-4), Austin, Texas, January 1969.

predominantly black colleges all the way down to and including the $8,075 level. Forty-five percent of all blacks employed by the State at salaries over $6,407 were in these two schools. Higher salaried positions involve not only the benefits of larger incomes, but also status, prestige, and authority over others. The figures for the black colleges clearly show that (a) there are blacks in Texas who can qualify for such positions, and (b) their opportunities to fill them are almost limited to situations in which the employees below them in the hierarchy are also black. Significantly, the two colleges employed only nine Anglos at salaries below $6,407.

Alabama

As discussed elsewhere in this report, Federal "Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration," applying to certain State agencies which receive Federal

funds, include the requirement that discrimination because of race be specifically prohibited and that appeal procedures be provided. The requirement is weak, and most States have found it possible to go through the expected motions without making traumatic substantive changes in their personnel policies. The State of Alabama, however, found it expedient to defy the regulation, and in June 1968 (when the regulation had been in force for 5½ years), the U.S. Department of Justice brought suit to force compliance. Exhibits presented as evidence in this suit (eventually decided against the State) are among the sources of data available. There also is a staff report prepared for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in connection with hearings held in Montgomery in April and May of 1968 concerning "equal economic opportunity" in the 16 counties of Alabama's black belt.

Data contained in exhibits presented in connection with the suit in U.S. District Court pertain only to agencies receiving grants-in-aid from the Federal Government and subject to the stipulation that personnel policies be governed by merit alone. These agencies are: Civil Defense; the crippled children's program in the Department of Education; Pensions and Security; Industrial Relations; Public Health; and Mental Health. All together, these agencies employed 3,071 full-time workers, 87 of whom were black. Sixty-two of the latter were in custodial jobs. A complete breakdown of the remaining 25 is not available. Most of them (19) worked for Pensions and Security; four were in Industrial Relations; two in Public Health. The 3,071 total employment for these six agencies included 1,052 clerk-typists and clerk-stenographers, grades I and II; two of them were black. Also included were 649 caseworkers, grade I; 13 of them were black. There were 194 employment interviewers I and II; one of them was black. The occupations of the remaining nine black noncustodial workers are not known.

The staff of the Commission on Civil Rights, in preparing exhibits for the 1968 hearings in Montgomery, found four State agencies with 560 jobs (including part-time and seasonal) in the 16 counties covered by the hearings. The Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, whose employees are paid entirely with Federal funds, maintains an office in each of the counties. Each office had from five to eight full-time employees, for a total of 98. Four of these were black, one in each of four offices. It is not known what jobs they performed. The Alabama Cooperative Extension Service is the result of a 1965 merger of separate Negro and white Extension Services. It therefore had a much higher proportion of blacks in prestige positions than is usual among Alabama government agencies. Seventeen of 40 Extension Farm Agents, 14 of 25 Extension Home Agents, and nine of 38 clerical workers were black. Despite the merger, black extension agents still visit only black homes and farms and give directions only to black clerical workers. The Department of Pensions and Security had 213 full-time employees in administrative and clerical jobs in the 16 counties, and one full-time janitor; the latter was the agency's only full-time black employee. The State Employment Service maintains five offices in the region, with a total of 29 full-time employees: five of these were Negro janitors, seven were white clerical and office workers, 12 were white professional and technical workers, and five were white office managers.

III. FEDERALLY AIDED STATE AGENCIES

The Federal standards referred to in connection with Alabama are administered by an office recently transferred from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the U.S. Civil Service Commission and now known as the Bureau of Intergovernmental Personnel Programs (BIPP). It is meagerly staffed and financed and has been able to do little in either investigation of compliance with the standards or enforcement. Such activities have been left largely to the Federal agencies through which aid is channeled and have been performed with varying degrees of energy and enthusiasm. At one extreme, the U.S. Employment Service has brought great pressure to bear on State employment security commissions to staff their offices with blacks at all levels and has kept continuing records of the degree of compliance. At the other extreme, there is nothing to indicate that the Office of Civil Defense has ever shown any interest in the matter.

Beginning in 1969, however, all State agencies falling within the jurisdiction of the BIPP have been required to submit an annual report on minority group employment by job categories. Because of budgetary constraints and administrative priorities to date these reports have received no processing other than sorting and filing. They were, however, made available to the author of this report, and the following is a brief discussion of their content and significance. They are of particular significance for this study because they include the States for which no other data were obtained (Arkansas, Florida, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and South Carolina), because they are the most recent data for any State, and because they shed light on the effectiveness of Federal standards as a means of obtaining equal employment opportunities.

Federally aided programs for which a nondiscriminatory merit system of personnel administration is required include the following:

1. A number of programs in the public health field, such as Comprehensive Health Planning, Comprehensive Public Health Services, Medical Facilities Construction and Modernization, and others, designated in the following discussion as "Health."

2. Old Age Assistance, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, and Child Welfare Services, designated in the following discussion as "Welfare."

3. Unemployment Insurance and Employment Service, designated in the following discussion as "Employment Security."

4. A number of programs for aiding people with various handicaps, such as Crippled Children's Services, Aid to the Blind, Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled, and others, designated in the following discussion as "Handicapped."

5. Civil Defense Financial Assistance, Surplus Property Utilization, and personnel administration, designated in the following discussion as "Miscellaneous."

Tables 9 through 13 present for each of these five categories of program the total employment and percentage of black employees at each of five levels: Executive and managerial, professional and technical, auxiliary and aide, clerical and office, and custodial and service. The data are given by State and for both 1969 and 1970. The "auxiliary and aide" category is probably the only one which is not self-explanatory. In most cases these are persons employed under special provisions assisting the "disadvantaged." Typically, a fairly high percentage of black employees are found in this category. The traditional Negro jobs, of course, are in the "custodial and service" category. The remaining three job categories are what elsewhere in this report have been grouped together as "white-collar jobs." Table 14 presents some summary data on blacks in such white-collar categories.

TABLE 9. FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT BY RACE IN SELECTED FEDERALLY AIDED STATE AGENCIES, 1969 and 1970: HEALTH

State	Year	Executive and managerial		Professional and technical		Auxiliary and aide		Clerical and office		Custodial and service	
		Total employment	Percent black	Total employment	Percent black	Total employment	Percent black	Total employment	Percent black	Total employment	Percent black
Alabama	1969	70	0	968	6.09	138	47.10	502	3.18	99	2.72
	1970	85	0	921	5.97	138	60.86	482	3.73	77	75.32
Arkansas	1969	19	0	381	1.31	56	26.78	234	1.70	18	33.33
	1970	120	0	1,298	4.00	110	21.81	444	2.47	522	11.87
Florida	1969	50	0	2,076	6.40	291	39.51	928	5.38	134	38.80
	1970	416	.72	1,129	11.60	165	47.27	1,675	4.29	292	26.36
Georgia	1969	148	0	366	3.55	58	77.58	427	9.36	9	77.77
	1970	145	0	1,465	6.27	113	62.83	907	5.73	90	93.33
Kentucky	1969	451	5.09	1,293	3.55	1,565	19.87	976	4.30	362	40.88
	1970	332	2.71	1,149	1.91	1,477	21.19	851	4.34	605	25.12
Louisiana	1969	91	0	687	.29	66	9.09	429	.93	102	29.41
	1970	305	.32	2,284	6.56	4,025	23.40	1,324	2.19	1,749	47.34
Mississippi	1969	40	0	574	.87	43	46.51	321	0	4	100.00
	1970	40	0	602	1.66	59	61.01	339	.29	5	80.00
North Carolina.	1969	221	1.80	1,407	7.53	183	42.07	741	2.69	85	74.11
	1970	236	2.11	1,737	6.39	225	45.77	773	4.26	80	81.25
Oklahoma	1969	86	2.32	465	1.93	102	21.56	252	1.58	16	18.75
	1970	147	3.40	933	6.21	1,497	9.48	545	6.42	492	4.06
South Carolina.	1969	160	0	877	5.24	138	51.44	472	2.33	160	77.50
	1970	166	1.80	930	6.02	154	54.54	499	3.40	164	75.00
Tennessee	1969	143	1.39	1,050	5.23	190	37.89	554	5.23	103	84.46
	1970	150	1.33	1,119	5.00	195	38.97	592	5.57	110	84.54
Texas	1969	120	0	1,441	.83	126	3.17	776	.52	742	7.68
	1970	504	1.58	4,740	5.46	5,715	22.92	2,310	2.64	3,948	16.10
Virginia	1969	374	1.60	1,576	8.62	203	36.94	861	6.03	52	94.23
	1970	166	0	1,894	7.91	835	7.90	309	36.24	56	83.92

SOURCE: Computed from data in the files of the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

Perhaps the most striking thing revealed by the data is the increase in white-collar employment of blacks over just a 1-year period. For all categories of agencies except "Handicapped," the percentage of blacks increased significantly, and in all without exception the absolute number was substantially larger in 1970 than in 1969. The total increase was 41.6 percent.

The other noteworthy observation is that the record for Employment Security, where a determined Federal push to achieve compliance has been in effect for some time, is not notably better than in Health, Welfare, and programs for the handicapped. Exactly what this signifies is not clear. It is consistent, however, with the generalization that pressure from above tends to produce just enough compliance to respond to the pressure and no more.

TABLE 10. FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT BY RACE IN SELECTED FEDERALLY AIDED STATE AGENCIES, 1969 and 1970: WELFARE

State	Year	Executive and managerial		Professional and technical		Auxiliary and aide		Clerical and office		Custodial and service	
		Total employment	Percent black	Total employment	Percent black	Total employment	Percent black	Total employment	Percent black	Total employment	Percent black
Alabama	1969	94	0	1,178	2.88	0	0	667	0.14	21	57.14
	1970	77	0	1,245	2.89	0	0	681	1.90	21	76.19
Arkansas	1969	184	2.17	513	6.04	14	21.42	429	3.26	20	65.00
	1970	194	2.06	593	8.76	27	48.14	484	5.99	22	90.90
Florida	1969	148	6.08	2,094	10.31	41	56.09	1,065	14.92	14	64.28
	1970	509	8.84	2,001	11.09	183	57.37	1,244	16.39	22	63.63
Georgia	1969	214	.93	1,866	6.80	166	22.89	959	7.61	0	0
	1970	208	.96	2,059	6.94	370	14.05	1,096	10.40	0	0
Kentucky	1969	219	4.10	1,507	3.98	290	7.58	766	8.09	135	13.33
	1970	172	4.06	1,612	4.09	331	12.99	830	8.55	138	17.39
Louisiana	1969	95	0	1,900	7.78	2	100.00	983	3.05	50	70.00
	1970	96	0	2,195	8.56	0	0	1,098	5.28	52	61.53
Mississippi	1969	143	0	955	.94	25	84.00	673	7.13	3	100.00
	1970	143	0	1,009	1.18	39	87.17	702	6.55	3	100.00
North Carolina.	1969	137	0	1,791	8.82	271	37.63	1,046	5.25	42	73.80
	1970	130	9.26	2,181	9.26	238	53.56	1,106	5.78	37	81.08
Oklahoma	1969	294	2.04	1,687	3.26	18	50.00	1,133	4.23	137	12.40
	1970	256	8.20	2,497	3.52	1,270	19.68	1,426	5.32	638	31.19
South Carolina.	1969	153	.65	695	8.77	82	85.36	422	2.60	0	0
	1970	148	.67	784	9.82	98	82.63	458	4.14	0	0
Tennessee	1969	282	8.15	1,281	6.55	102	70.58	732	4.50	105	49.52
	1970	297	8.08	1,395	6.59	135	68.88	738	5.28	18	88.88
Texas	1969	35	0	2,327	2.27	1	0	1,456	5.90	23	30.43
	1970	38	0	2,702	2.77	55	43.63	1,734	8.13	70	32.85
Virginia	1969	186	4.30	1,394	12.76	141	55.31	698	11.60	21	42.85
	1970	189	3.17	1,728	11.22	162	61.72	792	13.63	22	68.18

SOURCE: Computed from data in the files of the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

TABLE 11. FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT BY RACE IN SELECTED FEDERALLY AIDED STATE AGENCIES, 1969 and 1970: EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

State	Year	Executive and managerial		Professional and technical		Auxiliary and aide		Clerical and office		Custodial and service	
		Total employment	Percent black	Total employment	Percent black	Total employment	Percent black	Total employment	Percent black	Total employment	Percent black
Alabama	1969	174	0	463	6.04	0	0	304	0	14	85.71
	1970	177	0	480	7.08	0	0	321	.93	15	86.66
Arkansas	1969	96	3.12	406	7.14	38	86.84	200	7.00	20	45.00
	1970	92	4.34	446	14.57	31	74.19	211	10.90	21	57.14
Florida	1969	267	4.49	767	6.51	47	70.21	460	7.17	24	79.16
	1970	362	2.48	719	8.62	111	45.04	490	11.02	24	95.83
Georgia	1969	168	4.16	539	6.86	46	73.91	337	11.57	22	95.45
	1970	177	1.69	568	8.45	54	64.81	349	14.61	23	91.30
Kentucky	1969	140	6.42	486	3.49	71	29.57	262	2.29	42	61.90
	1970	80	0	630	5.07	72	12.50	322	7.14	52	59.61
Louisiana	1969	155	1.29	566	4.59	26	96.15	307	6.84	23	34.78
	1970	89	2.24	629	3.97	19	100.00	346	9.53	22	36.36
Mississippi	1969	146	.68	296	4.39	79	56.96	204	1.47	5	80.00
	1970	138	0	327	3.36	81	56.79	202	1.98	5	80.00
North Carolina .	1969	145	2.06	732	6.14	18	77.77	62	4.83	11	90.90
	1970	154	1.29	808	7.54	29	79.31	412	14.32	11	90.90
Oklahoma	1969	120	3.33	364	6.59	95	29.47	147	13.60	19	42.10
	1970	129	3.10	457	7.87	89	33.70	129	7.75	18	44.44
South Carolina.	1969	70	0	358	2.23	32	28.12	162	1.85	12	100.00
	1970	70	0	398	1.50	68	52.94	155	2.58	14	92.85
Tennessee	1969	188	6.38	563	13.32	72	76.38	296	.68	14	42.86
	1970	179	3.91	550	10.00	33	96.96	272	9.19	13	76.92
Texas	1969	369	.81	1,866	3.16	114	36.84	762	5.38	49	89.79
	1970	381	1.04	1,965	3.61	129	39.53	860	7.67	68	67.64
Virginia	1969	90	5.55	509	9.23	21	42.85	255	7.84	0	0
	1970	93	6.45	537	11.73	26	53.84	258	10.07	0	0

SOURCE: Computed from data in the files of the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

TABLE 12. FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT BY RACE IN SELECTED FEDERALLY AIDED STATE AGENCIES, 1969 and 1970: HANDICAPPED

State	Year	Executive and managerial		Professional and technical		Auxiliary and aide		Clerical and office		Custodial and service	
		Total employment	Percent black	Total employment	Percent black	Total employment	Percent black	Total employment	Percent black	Total employment	Percent black
Alabama	1969	30	0	376	9.84	10	70.00	310	1.29	1	100.0
	1970	34	0	393	9.41	11	63.63	325	1.84	1	100.0
Arkansas	1969	67	1.49	329	9.11	240	5.41	214	3.73	117	20.51
	1970	59	1.69	354	8.75	162	10.49	207	5.79	205	11.70
Florida	1969	82	0	598	3.67	0	0	605	6.61	10	90.00
	1970	79	0	602	3.65	0	0	603	6.63	11	81.81
Georgia	1969	54	0	501	2.59	14	42.85	369	10.29	62	38.70
	1970	59	0	499	2.60	13	23.07	240	13.75	61	37.70
Kentucky	1969	48	0	205	1.95	5	20.00	223	9.86	5	20.00
	1970	40	0	229	.87	9	11.11	258	8.91	6	0
Louisiana	1969	56	0	193	2.59	26	7.69	189	2.64	1	100.00
	1970	57	1.75	232	5.60	17	11.76	209	4.30	3	33.33
Mississippi	1969	39	0	263	8.74	11	18.18	197	6.59	0	0
	1970	37	0	271	7.38	20	25.00	219	8.67	0	0
North Carolina	1969	144	2.77	492	7.92	79	32.91	302	2.64	19	94.73
	1970	156	1.92	471	9.34	83	34.93	303	3.30	28	67.85
Oklahoma	1969	(1)									
	1970										
South Carolina	1969	74	0	414	6.76	276	9.05	134	5.97	9	44.44
	1970	71	0	398	6.28	243	11.11	157	6.36	8	100.00
Tennessee	1969	53	1.88	235	8.51	37	5.40	271	3.32	7	71.42
	1970	54	1.85	253	7.11	38	21.05	289	4.15	7	71.42
Texas	1969	57	5.26	805	1.98	72	11.11	654	5.65	1	0
	1970	57	3.50	807	2.23	98	12.24	688	5.66	1	0
Virginia	1969	73	2.73	378	6.34	46	28.26	260	6.92	37	5.40
	1970	150	3.33	292	7.53	24	37.50	252	9.52	5	20.00

[1] Included with Welfare.

SOURCE: Computed from data in the files of the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

TABLE 13. FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT BY RACE IN SELECTED FEDERALLY AIDED STATE AGENCIES, 1969 and 1970: MISCELLANEOUS

State	Year	Executive and managerial		Professional and technical		Auxiliary and aide		Clerical and office		Custodial and service	
		Total employment	Percent black	Total employment	Percent black	Total employment	Percent black	Total employment	Percent black	Total employment	Percent black
Alabama	1969	43	0	41	0	0	0	59	0	0	0
	1970	56	0	33	0	0	0	62	0	23	52.17
Arkansas	1969	35	0	17	0	0	0	27	3.70	2	50.00
	1970	38	0	19	0	8	0	29	3.44	5	20.00
Florida	1969	69	0	59	0	2	0	154	.64	4	50.00
	1970	88	0	57	0	10	0	162	1.23	62	9.67
Georgia	1969	87	0	34	2.94	4	0	94	3.19	1	0
	1970	84	0	62	1.61	0	0	109	2.75	12	75.00
Kentucky	1969	14	0	47	2.12	0	0	66	1.51	0	0
	1970	26	0	54	1.85	0	0	72	4.16	12	8.33
Louisiana	1969	27	0	70	0	0	0	93	0	4	75.00
	1970	31	0	84	7.14	0	0	99	0	5	80.00
Mississippi	1969	31	0	15	6.66	0	0	28	0	0	0
	1970	30	0	22	4.54	0	0	33	0	14	100.00
North Carolina .	1969	48	2.08	52	5.76	0	0	102	4.90	1	100.00
	1970	44	2.27	61	8.19	0	0	116	4.31	14	35.71
Oklahoma	1969	27	0	27	0	0	0	34	2.94	0	0
	1970	31	3.22	31	0	16	18.75	40	2.50	1	100.00
South Carolina	1969	44	0	23	0	1	0	40	2.50	0	0
	1970	15	0	33	3.03	1	0	27	11.11	9	77.77
Tennessee	1969	52	3.84	17	0	1	0	56	0	3	100.00
	1970	47	2.12	14	0	1	0	37	0	13	30.76
Texas	1969	38	0	23	0	2	0	58	1.72	7	28.57
	1970	46	2.17	55	7.27	1	0	77	0	16	12.50
Virginia	1969	28	0	25	0	0	0	57	5.26	1	100.00
	1970	22	.22	0	0	0	0	56	17.85	3	100.00

SOURCE: Computed from data in the files of the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

TABLE 14. BLACKS IN WHITE-COLLAR JOBS, FEDERALLY AIDED AGENCIES IN 13 SOUTHERN STATES, 1969 and 1970

Category of agency	Percentage of blacks among white-collar employees		Total number of black white-collar employees	
	1969	1970	1969	1970
Health	4.8	5.1	918	1,749
Welfare	6.1	7.2	1,977	2,354
Employment security	5.3	6.6	722	986
Handicapped	5.2	5.2	482	700
Miscellaneous	1.4	2.7	26	54
Total	5.4	6.0	4,125	5,843

SOURCE: Computed from data in the files of the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

IV. SCHOOL DISTRICTS

In State governments, as we have seen, the problem is to open up job classifications from which Negroes have, by one means or another, traditionally been excluded. In public education the problem is a different, and to some extent an opposite, one. Public school teaching has long been a profession open to Negroes in the South and has been one of the major avenues of upward mobility. According to a recent report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, in standard metropolitan statistical area central cities in the Southeast, 44 percent of all high school teachers in 1965 were Negroes; for suburbs, the figure was 34.4 percent; for the two combined, the percentage was 39.3. In the Southwest, which includes the two States of Texas and Oklahoma plus Arizona and New Mexico, the comparable figure was 22.9 percent. In no other part of the country did it go above 6 percent, or for central cities, 10 percent. The South has, thus, been an area where most of the employment opportunities for Negroes in education have been found. Negro colleges in the South have been geared to this market, and Negro aspirations have been built on this foundation. It was, of course, not equal employment opportunity, but rather the maintenance of separate school systems for blacks and whites, that created this situation; and, ironically, the broadening of educational opportunities for black children through the desegregation of schools has tended to restrict employment opportunities for black adults in education. To a significant extent, desegregation has resulted in termination of employment or demotion of black teachers; to a greater extent, it has resulted in the closing off of entry to the public education field for black college graduates.

The basic source of information on this subject is a report compiled by the National Education Association (NEA) in 1965 and published in 1966. This report, in turn, is based upon complaints received by the NEA of unfair treatment, and the data accordingly omit: (1) Any black teachers in the South who have not been displaced or demoted, and (2) any who have, but who, for reasons of fear, apathy, ignorance, or a sense of futility, have made no protest. The conclusions which can be drawn from such data are limited but significant.

One conclusion which has become abundantly clear is that, regardless of formal certification requirements, black teachers in the South are regarded by school boards and superintendents as being qualified to teach black children but not qualified to teach children generally. That this perception is widespread can be inferred from the fact that it is taken for granted in letters of dismissal, however politely and even compassionately worded. "I know you have been hoping that we could continue the present school organization and I regret that I must request you to inform your teachers that the teaching positions in the . . . Negro School will be terminated on May 25, 1965." "It is now apparent that your job must be vacated due to the lack of students enrolled in your school. I certainly wish that there were openings for you in this system but there is no vacancy that your qualifications would enable you to fill. I feel that if you could manage to return to school and obtain an additional amount of work in a specialized area . . . I do feel that these teachers are going to have to have specialities and be able to compete in a real academic way to obtain these jobs." (The latter quotation is from a letter sent to all teachers in a Negro school.) What is expressed here is not the feeling that Negro teachers, because of being black, are inherently unworthy to teach white children, although that feeling may well be present too; it is rather the feeling that their preparation was adequate to qualify them for the job of teaching black children but not for the job of teaching white children. The reason is not that white children are considered more difficult to teach, but rather an implicit assumption that it was less important for black children to be well taught. This casts

a harsh retrospective light on the separate-but-equal period of southern education; of more urgent moment, however, is the dilemma in which it places Negro educators.

Much more than in the white community, the teacher in the Negro community is looked to for leadership. The reason is simply that teachers constitute a much larger proportion of the total number displaying leadership qualities in the black community. An urban concentration of Negroes will have its own physicians, pharmacists, grocers, and morticians, but proportionately much less than the corresponding white community; even there, it will have few if any aldermen, mayors, sheriffs, chamber of commerce presidents, bank presidents, and the like. And in rural areas, there may be no natural leaders in the black communities except teachers and ministers. When the issue before the public is in the field of education, as with school desegregation, it is particularly appropriate therefore that the black community should look to its members who have entered the teaching profession for leadership. Yet, in the circumstances that exist, a black teacher leading a movement to integrate the local schools is leading himself out of a job—and this is true even if, which is a big "if," there are no reprisals against him for taking part in civil rights activities. For the Negro teacher is in fact doubly vulnerable: not only does his job tend to "be vacated" with integration, but he is also the only community leader of his color whose livelihood depends directly upon the good will of whites. The Negro minister, mortician, grocer, pharmacist, and physician all earn their livings from the patronage of Negroes. They can be hounded and harrassed in various effective ways by white public officials, bankers, wholesalers, and so on; but only the teacher carries on his work according to a routine established by a white supervisor and is paid with a check signed by a white. In view of these considerations, it is not surprising that many black southern educators are looked upon by their constituencies as Uncle Toms. Whether so by disposition or not, they tend to be *ex officio* Uncle Toms. Even after their jobs have been "vacated," the hope of finding a new niche in the system is often sufficient to keep them from openly bucking it.

The NEA found 661 displaced black teachers in the 13-State area in the summer and fall of 1965. The largest numbers of these were in Florida, Texas, and North Carolina, which accounted for 70.8 percent of the total. Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina, on the other hand, accounted for only three cases among them, or less than 0.5 percent. This contrast well exemplifies the inherent irony of the situation: those States which have made the least effort to comply with school desegregation requirements have also done the least violence to the economic and professional interests of black teachers. The contrast is even more pronounced when the proximate causes of teacher displacement are examined.

Of 424 cases for which cause of dismissal was determined, 216 resulted from a new legal requirement for certification in Florida. The law establishes a minimum score on the National Teacher Examination, required for the certification of new teachers and also in certain cases for the continued certification of teachers in the system. It also permits counties to establish their own, more stringent standards. Teachers failing to achieve the required minimum score, which varies from 500 to 600 among counties, may receive "Rank V" certification, but this carries a salary of only $2,800 per annum without the possibility of tenure.

The National Teacher Examination was not created for the purpose of discriminating between black and white teachers. It was, however, created largely by white educators and without regard to its possible relevance to black teachers. As with many other qualifying examinations, it is probable that it contains a strong cultural bias in favor of the white middle class; such at least is the opinion of the NEA, which incorporates the following statement in its report:

> It is highly probable that scores in the National Teacher Examination are affected by the social class and geographical section from which the candidate comes. It is, therefore, probable that the application of NTE cutoff scores to teacher certification, appointment, and promotion procedures will bear most heavily upon the Negro teaching population.

It is not here alleged that this was the overt purpose of instituting the requirement on the part of the State, or that this was the overt purpose of establishing minimums above the statewide minimum on the part of some counties. Rather, this experience illustrates yet another irony in the situation: often enlightened and well-meant attempts to improve the quality of public service carry with them unintended racial discrimination. The whole merit system of civil service is open to question on this basis, as will be discussed in a later section of this report. But whatever the legislative intent may have been in Florida, the effect has been to make Rank V certification largely a device for keeping black teachers in the school system on an interim basis (i.e., as long as they are needed), without job security, and at a salary far below either regular teachers' salaries or a decent minimum standard. In one county where this information was sought, for example, of 55 persons teaching under Rank V certificates, 48 were black.

The next most common cause of displacement was school desegregation, where this resulted in (1) schools

being closed (113 cases), (2) enrollments being reduced by pupil transfers (42 cases), or (3) grades being dropped from schools otherwise continued, as when a Negro junior-senior high school becomes an integrated junior high school (14 cases). These cases were concentrated in the States where desegregation had been carried farthest: Texas (54), Tennessee (28), Kentucky (21), and Arkansas (21), accounted for 73.4 percent of them, with North Carolina, Virginia, and Florida taking care of all but four of the rest. The only cases in the heartland of the Deep South–South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana–were four in Alabama. In these States, the pattern of desegregation (if any) generally has been token integration of the white schools and a continued full operation of the black schools. This has protected the white schools from any more significant change than admitting a few foreign exchange students and has protected the black teachers and administrators from losing their jobs. Where desegregation is real, its result is that there no longer is a black school system–and this is what brings the crunch.

The third largest category might be termed punitive dismissal. School funds are commonly apportioned on the basis of average daily attendance, and in those districts where black students have boycotted schools or gone on strike in protest against segregationist policies, one result has been a financial cutback. Some school boards have found what they consider to be a fitting accommodation to this cutback in the release of black teachers. There were six such cases reported, all of them in Alabama. In addition, 18 teachers were dismissed directly because of civil rights activities, either their own (12), or those of members of their families (six). Of the total of 24 reported punitive dismissals, half were in Alabama, another 25 percent in Georgia, two each in North Carolina and Virginia, and one each in Kentucky and Louisiana. Mississippi and South Carolina emerge with unblemished records, with no dismissals of black teachers reported for any cause.

That the Negro teacher was still regarded only as a teacher for a Negro school as recently as 1965 is amply shown by data on elementary school teachers in selected cities, contained in the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights report cited earlier. The data are for selected cities only and omit Louisiana among the States dealt with in the present study. Of the remainder, in Alabama (two cities), Mississippi (two cities), and South Carolina (four cities), all Negro teachers (814 out of 1,964 total elementary school teachers in these eight systems) were teaching in schools whose enrollments were 90 percent or more black. More than 90 percent of black teachers were in 90 percent black schools in all systems reported except three in Texas (Corpus Christi, Lubbock, and Wichita Falls) and two in Kentucky (Louisville and Lexington). More than 50 percent of black teachers were in 90 percent black schools in all 37 systems reported, and more than 60 percent in all but Lexington, Ky. More than 70 percent of black teachers were in schools having a majority of black students in all systems, and more than 75 percent in all but Corpus Christi. Schools having a majority of black students but less than 90 percent are of particular significance because they were almost certainly former Negro schools which had been desegregated. Among the 37 school districts surveyed, only Miami, Atlanta, Winston-Salem, Oklahoma City, Nashville, four cities in Texas (Corpus Christi, Houston, Lubbock, and Wichita Falls), and the two Kentucky cities showed any Negro teachers at all in such schools, and the total number was only 107 out of 5,358 black teachers in these 11 systems. Whether this indicates that only a few formerly black elementary schools had been integrated, or that when they were the black teachers were displaced, is impossible to determine from the data. What is clear is that very few white children had black teachers.

More recent information is not available in such systematic form, and undoubtedly the situation has changed since 1965. There is an abundance of case material, however. Under mounting pressure from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a number of cities now have black teachers in white schools which did not in 1965. A Federal District Court ruled in 1971 that the Columbus, Miss., school district could not use a cut-off score on the National Teacher Examination as a criterion for hiring, on the grounds that the test was discriminatory, albeit unintentionally so, and that it was not germane to job qualifications. Columbus had imposed a requirement of a score of 1,000 at the time its schools were desegregated. The judge stated in his ruling that this would allow 90 percent of white graduates of Mississippi colleges to qualify, while disqualifying 89 percent of black graduates. The city was ordered to maintain the ratio of black to white teachers that prevailed before desegregation. Meanwhile, however, testimony before the Senate Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity in the summer of 1971 indicated a rapid trend toward the extinction of black principals in the public schools of the South. Reporting on a survey conducted by the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the executive secretary of that body reported that desegregation had cost the jobs of over 1,200 black high school principals. Details included a 3-year drop in Alabama from 250 to 50, an 8-year decline in Arkansas from 134 to 14, and in Florida over a 6-year period, from 102 to 13. One hundred and fifteen

principals were reported as having been demoted or dismissed in Georgia, 68 in Louisiana, and 250 in Mississippi. Declines were from 227 to 8 in North Carolina (8 years), 144 to 33 in South Carolina (5 years), 73 to 17 in Tennessee (8 years), and from 107 to 16 in Virginia (5 years).

V. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL UNITS

The most complete data available on city, town, county, and special district (other than school district) government is contained in the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights report already cited for 1967 data on State government in Louisiana, Georgia, and Tennessee. The survey covered all governmental units except school district and Federal in the four standard metropolitan statistical areas of Atlanta, Baton Rouge, Houston, and Memphis (as well as three others outside the South). Included in these four SMSA's are 127 such governments, including (parts of) four State governments, the four central-city governments, 12 county governments, 11 other large-city governments, 78 small municipal governments, and 18 special districts, with a total of 65,045 employees. Of these, all but two "other large" and six "small" municipalities responded to the survey questionnaire, giving a total coverage of 119 governments with 63,689 employees, 15,154 of them black. This corpus of data, all collected at the same time, by the same people, with the same questionnaire, permits the making of direct comparisons, between regions as well as between types of governments, to a degree not justified in the case of other data, drawn from disparate sources.

On the average in the four SMSA's, the central cities are the largest employers and the largest employers of Negroes. The city of Atlanta has a few less total employees than do State agencies in Atlanta and employs a few less Negroes than do special districts in the area; and the city of Baton Rouge employs a much smaller total number of people than does the State in its area. All other cases conform to the averages just cited, and in every case, the central city employs more blacks than the State, county, or the combined total for other municipalities. The principal reason for this is clearly that the city offers far more traditional Negro jobs. On the average, in the four central cities, 74 percent of all Negro employees were either laborers or service workers in departments other than fire and police, mainly streets and public utilities. In Atlanta, the city employed 1,716 blacks, only 32 of them in white-collar jobs; the State, in the same area, employed only 342 blacks, but 205 of them were in white-collar jobs. In Baton Rouge, the city had 307 black employees, five in white-collar jobs; the State had 197, 23 in white-collar jobs. In Houston, the State employed slightly less blacks in white-collar jobs than did the city, but more on a percentage basis (67 of 159 for the State, as opposed to 91 of 1,479 for the city). The same was true in Memphis, where the city employed 4,226 blacks, 582 of them in white-collar jobs, while the State had 131 white-collar workers in a total black employment of 411.

It is true that State governments have proportionately less of the types of jobs that are traditionally reserved for blacks, but this alone does not account for the difference. The four central-city governments combined controlled 7,689 unskilled labor jobs, whereas in the State agencies in the same SMSA's there were only 1,622 jobs at that level. This in itself, however, would not prevent these jobs from being filled by blacks to the same degree in both types of jurisdictions. In fact, however, 80 percent of them at the city level, but only 35 percent of them at the State level, were so filled.

A pronounced and curious pattern thus emerges from the comparison of State and city governments, operating in the same areas and drawing on the same labor forces. State governments apparently are relatively immune to pressure operating on city governments to provide large numbers of jobs for blacks, but are subject to pressure from which the city governments are immune to open up nontraditional jobs to blacks. The only conspicuous exception to this generalization concerns police work, traditionally a white job: State police jobs have opened

up to Negroes much less than have city police jobs. In the four SMSA's, 8.2 percent of city police jobs, but only 2.7 percent of State police jobs were held by blacks. A pattern of differences suggests the presence of identifiable causal factors, and this pattern will be further discussed in our concluding section.

No significant phenomena are observable in the data for counties and other municipalities in the four SMSA's. The operation of hospitals was a major function of the counties involved, accounting for 27.4 percent of all jobs and for 61 percent of jobs held by blacks. Among other municipalities, 95 percent of jobs held by blacks were in "community development" and "public utilities," that is, streets and garbage. Special districts in the four SMSA's were mainly hospitals, and mainly in Atlanta; like hospitals generally, they employed substantial numbers of Negroes.

Scattered data are available for other areas. A report by the U.S. Conference of Mayors shows that from 1960 to 1965, Savannah, Ga., increased the proportion of Negroes in city employment from 27.1 percent to 32.1 percent (the population of Savannah was about 34 percent black in 1965). Most of the increase was in the Departments of Recreation and Police. Data for Miami and Dade County, Fla., gathered for another part of this study, indicated that Dade County is a better source of jobs above the unskilled level for Negroes, primarily because the county administers hospitals and a bus system. The position of bus driver in a municipal system probably belongs in the category of "new traditional Negro jobs." A report of the Oklahoma State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights states that Negroes in city and county employment in the Lawton, Okla., area are "primarily in traditional job categories."

Smaller towns and rural counties in the South are generally not significant as employers. Elected officials generally constitute a large proportion of their total work force and reflect voter preferences rather than hiring practices. Nonelected government workers tend to be either part-time employees or prisoners impressed for public works projects (mainly roads), both of which categories have been excluded from the coverage of this report. Except in one special case, there is nothing to suggest a tendency to depart from traditional employment patterns in such communities.

The special case is black-controlled communities. Here and there such communities have existed for many years. Hobson City, Ala., for example, has been an all-Negro municipality since its incorporation in 1899, when the Temperance Party controlling the city of Anniston excised their black ghetto, which they feared might tip the balance in favor of the wets in an impending election. Such communities are manifestations, not of black power, but of Jim Crow. As such, they are seen as no threat to white power and enjoy generally good relations with surrounding communities. Anniston and Oxford, for example, furnish fire protection service gratis to Hobson City. The city has, however, only four full-time employees—two maintenance men (old traditional Negro jobs), a policeman (new traditional Negro job), and the town clerk (nontraditional white-collar job).

Where black-controlled communities are forming in the 1960's and 1970's, the circumstances are quite different. In most cases, they are different because they involve communities which contain an important minority of white residents. This is true of Tuskegee and Greene and Macon Counties, Ala.; Fayette, Miss.; and Sparta and Hancock County, Ga. In all these places, as well as in Lowndes County, Ala., McIntosh and Taliaferro Counties, Ga.; Madison County, La.; Bolivar, Claiborne, Coahoma, Holmes, Jefferson, Leflore, Madison, and Tunica Counties, Miss.; and Robeson County, N.C., recent voter registration efforts have borne fruit in black majorities at the polls. For a variety of reasons, a black majority at the polls does not necessarily mean black control of elective offices. Some black voters will vote for the man whom they consider the best qualified candidate, regardless of color; some black voters, particularly in the rural South, regard government as the rightful province of whites. The loss of their margin in registrations tends to revitalize the forces of white power which are still formidable, particularly in terms of economic sanctions and police harassment, and which may be exercised either in influencing decisions of potential candidates or in influencing voters. And finally, where black officials are elected, they do not necessarily act as a bloc. A three- or five-man board of commissioners, for example, will frequently have long included one Negro, widely respected, and owing his election to the votes of whites as well as blacks. Such a man is not adequately described as an Uncle Tom. He is likely to be one who has taken a firm stand for the rights of his people, at great risk to himself, in times when civil rights was not the popular cause that it is today. Nevertheless, the recent election of one or two young militants, and the fact that they regard him as an Uncle Tom, does not help. On many issues, he will find himself siding with the white minority.

Wherever any of the above conditions predominate, the achievement of a black majority of registered voters will not affect the racial pattern of employment in any fundamental way. Increasingly, however, there will be mixed communities in the black belt which are governed by blacks. Where this occurs, either of two courses may

be followed. Black elected officials will be conscious of the problem of job discrimination and will seek to avoid it, or to avoid its appearance, by keeping some whites on the payroll. Whites may be unwilling to remain under such circumstances, however, in which case government itself will have become a new traditional Negro job. No cases of this phenomenon have been discovered in our investigations, although Fayette, Miss., comes very close. The alternative is one in which the whites decide to accept the new situation and live with it as best they can, keeping as active as possible in local politics and government and keeping on as good terms as possible with black elected officials. This case is well illustrated by Tuskegee, and surrounding Macon County, Ala. The mayor and about half the city's department heads are white; about 70 percent of subordinate employees are black. In the county government, the highest elected official, the sheriff, and half of the Board of Commissioners are black; all other persons in supervisory positions are white. Among subordinates, about 45 percent are black. As time passes, retirements and promotions will bring more blacks to higher echelons, but the pattern is already well established of a truly integrated government, surely one of the few such anywhere in the world.

Another type of instance of the exercise of black political power is illustrated by Roosevelt City, Ala. Deceptively similar to Hobson City, as black separatism is similar to Jim Crow, Roosevelt City is an all-black municipality which was incorporated not to accommodate whites, but to defy them. The urban complex known as Birmingham, Ala., is actually a conglomeration of separate incorporated municipalities and unincorporated districts under county administration. Several of the municipalities are close to having a 50-percent black population, and are contiguous to a large unincorporated area which is virtually 100 percent black. Were it not for considerations of race, the latter area would tend to be absorbed by annexation into the surrounding cities. In the actual situation, however, white elected officials tenuously maintaining a thin margin of white votes have no interest in adding large blocs of black voters to their constituencies. The area has therefore remained county, and as a consequence has been inadequately provided with fire and police protection and other municipal services. Roosevelt City was incorporated as the answer to this problem. It is not clear why its incorporation was opposed by the white power structure, but it was opposed, with the result that the law governing the incorporation of municipalities has been amended to make further such incorporations impossible. Roosevelt City did manage, however, to complete the legal requisites before the amendment went into effect, and it is now in the process of annexing other parts of Birmingham's black belt. It could easily become a city of 25,000 population in a short time. At present, with about one-fourth of that number, it has a six-man police force, a four-man street and sanitation department, and a clerk, plus a part-time mayor, a recorder, and a city attorney, all of them black, as is the volunteer fire department. The mayor reports that, despite a low salary scale, there is a considerable backlog of qualified applicants for city employment.

The same legal vacuum which led to the establishment of Roosevelt City in 1967 does not exist in a great many other metropolitan areas. The same social pressures do, however, and to inhabitants of the black ghettos of Atlanta, New Orleans, Miami, and elsewhere, Roosevelt City stands as a model of the only acceptable alternative to real integration. Ghetto self-government has been rejected as impractical by municipal administrators, who point out that the rim of the city supports the center financially, and who protest that they are hiring black policemen as fast as they can find them. Roosevelt City effectively refutes both of these arguments.

VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Editor's Note.—This manuscript was completed before the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 expanded the coverage of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to include State and local governments, governmental agencies, and political subdivisions (except for elected officials, their personal assistants and immediate advisors). Since it is still too early to assess the impact of that amendment, the authors' conclusions and recommendations on Federal action have been retained without change, as possible guides for the administration and enforcement of the new legislation.

The situation described earlier reveals significant differences, not only between governmental units, but within governmental units. This final section will focus attention on these differences, attempting to find a pattern and to infer causation. Such inferences will then form the basis for recommendations for action programs aimed at enlarging the area of equal employment opportunities in State and local government.

It would be a reasonable *a priori* assumption that differences between governments were mainly accounted for by geography, with the Deep South offering relatively little in the way of equal employment opportunities, the Middle South relatively more, and the Border States most. Such differences clearly exist, but they are not important because they cannot provide the basis for action programs. Equally clear, and of much greater interest, is the fact that geography is not the only reason for differences among governments. This is most vividly shown by a comparison of Georgia and Louisiana, which are about equally "Deep South." The State of Georgia employed in the capital 206 blacks in supervisory, professional, or white-collar positions. They amounted to 4 percent of total employment in such positions and were found in 59 percent of the agencies. The State of Louisiana, on the other hand, employed in its capital 23 blacks in supervisory, professional, or white-collar positions. They were only 0.5 percent of the total of such employment and were found in only 11 percent of the agencies. These are major differences, not obscured by the fact that both States have a long way to go. They might be explained by differences in the legal status of blacks, by differences in the size and character of the capital city, by differences in the nature of the white leadership or of the black leadership, by differences in the proportion of blacks in the total population or of blacks in the educated population, by differences in union representation, or by a number of other factors. Most of these theoretical possibilities can be eliminated in the actual case at hand, however. There is no significant difference in the legal status of blacks vis-a-vis the government in the two jurisdictions. Atlanta is certainly a larger and more cosmopolitan city than is Baton Rouge. It is difficult, however, to conclude that the city pulls the State up, since the city government actually employs a smaller proportion of white-collar blacks than does the State. The proportion of blacks in total population is almost identical for the two States. In no case in our investigation was union representation found to be involved with government employment. We are left, primarily, with white and black leadership and other (unknown) factors as the possible causes for the difference.

Looking more closely, then, at the question of leadership, we find an interesting comparison to be made between Virginia and North Carolina. Both are in the Middle South, and they are closely similar in population and in proportion of blacks. In North Carolina, however, the Governor has taken a strong position of leadership for equal employment opportunities in government, while in Virginia the official position has been that there was no problem ("Gov. Mills E. Godwin, Jr., told a group of eight civil rights leaders yesterday that the State has 'an open employment policy.' " Richmond *Times Dispatch,* August 30, 1969.) Of Virginia State agencies, 52.3 percent employed no blacks in white-collar jobs, compared to only 35.8 percent of agencies without blacks in North Carolina. The difference is substantial, is even greater in terms of employment and cannot readily be attributed to any factor other than leadership from the Governor's office. However, it is accounted for almost entirely by token integration. Of North Carolina

agencies, 37.8 percent practiced token integration at the white-collar level, compared to only 22.5 percent in Virginia. If we look at the positive side, in North Carolina there was only one small agency which had more than token integration of white-collar and supervisory employees, while in Virginia there were 14, accounting for 5.5 percent of all State jobs.

This contrast suggests a hypothesis: that the effect of pressure generated from above varies in inverse proportion to the distance between the source and the point of pressure. Statements of broad public policy by the Governor's office tend to be regarded by insiders as part of the government's public relations front, and not as guides to action programs, which can be communicated down the chain of command in the form of direct orders. It is to the sergeant, not the general, that the private reacts. If the general calls the troops together and informs them that the barracks are a mess, everybody agrees and goes back to living in his mess. If the sergeant says, "If these barracks aren't clean the next time the general comes around, everybody in this outfit will be on K.P. for a month," the barracks will be spotless. The most that a governor can do, if his wish for equal employment opportunities in government has not been acceded to, is to call in agency heads and express displeasure, which they can then allay by dressing up the front office with one or two blacks. In North Carolina, a special agency was created to work for equal employment opportunities in all sectors of the economy including State government, but it possesses little power beyond the power to negotiate and to give publicity, and it perhaps even weakens the program by taking it outside the regular chain of command. In any case, the effect of pressure from above in North Carolina seems to have been to bring about very extensive token integration, but little if any real integration.

This hypothesis is further strengthened by a comparison of agencies within a State government, because the differences that appear here are far greater than those between governments. Even Louisiana had its State Library, in which 10 percent of the professional and white-collar workers were black, and every State still had a number of all white agencies. It will be helpful if we can detect a pattern in these differences.

A considerable number of similarities from State to State do in fact exist. Clearly there are agencies which, because of the kind of work they do, find it particularly difficult to offer equal employment opportunities, regardless of geographical location. This seems to be true, for example, of agencies concerned primarily with the world outdoors. Departments of conservation, parks, agriculture, mining, highways, etc., almost everywhere employed very few blacks, practically none in white-collar jobs, except for cases such as black extension agents assigned to work with black farmers. At the other end of the spectrum are agencies concerned primarily with people in various kinds of trouble—departments of health, mental health, employment security, and public welfare, for example—which seemed to have an easy time desegregating their employment rosters. Logically this latter list should include prisons, but, while many southern State prison systems provided a wide range of employment opportunities for blacks, others did not.

Some of the reasons for these systematic differences are obvious. Agencies dealing with people in trouble, for example, are more likely to have personal service jobs at their disposal, and personal service is a traditional function of blacks. In terms of salary and professional status, some of these are fairly good jobs, and no doubt there are black nurses who earn more and command more respect among their colleagues than do many of the white patients under their care. Nevertheless, the relationship is one in which the nurse is serving the patient. The occupation of prison guard, on the other hand, while much more humble than that of nurse, involves an element of command and control in relation to the client which is not consistent with the traditional relationship between black and white. Others of the people-in-trouble agencies, while they do involve a superior/inferior relationship between employee and client, do so on a one-to-one basis that makes possible segregation-by-desk: white applicants for public assistance or unemployment benefits are simply not referred to black caseworkers or counselors. Another factor in establishing this pattern is that in our society there is a tendency for people in trouble to be disproportionately black and for people who use the State's outdoor facilities to be disproportionately white.

This is relevant because it appears that in many cases the opening up of equal employment opportunities has come about as a result of client pressure, or what might be termed pressure from below, sometimes reinforced by outside pressure (from newspapers, candidates for public office, the Federal Government, etc.), but originating in the segment of the public served by the agency. Not uncommonly, such pressure is triggered by an incident—a black prisoner shot by a white guard, a black welfare recipient offended by a white caseworker, etc.,—which may explain such exceptions as the Kentucky State prison system, which simply has not had its incidents yet.

In between are a great many types of agencies which in one State have only black janitors, in another have one black carefully displayed in each office, and in another have blacks in significant numbers throughout the hierarchy. These are agencies most of whose work is

done in offices and does not primarily involve direct contact with the public. Most of us never know whether the person checking our tax return or tabulating information on industrial production by county is black or white, male or female, young or old, etc. Client pressure, the very effective pressure from below, is almost impossible to generate in such cases, while pressure from above, the not very effective kind that comes from the Governor's office, is dispersed generally over the agencies of a government and cannot be used to explain the fact that a Revenue Department, a Commerce Department, or an Attorney General's Office has put into practice the principle of equal opportunity in employment.

What does appear to explain it in most cases is pressure from within, either in the form of a generalized community support for the creation of equal employment opportunities, such as might develop at a college or university, or more commonly in the person of the agency head. The agency head appears to be the man who stands at the most critical point in the process, with the major focus of power either to obstruct or to facilitate. This is so in part because "equal employment opportunities" sounds like a passive program but is in reality an active one. An agency head who wishes to resist pressure from above, below, or within the agency, needs merely to sit back and recite the litany of "no qualified applicants." If the pressure becomes intense, he can erect the barricade of token integration and secure his position. If, on the other hand, the agency is really going to offer equal employment opportunities, it must make changes in its procedures, and this requires the active leadership of the agency head. Already this suggests one program recommendation. Typically, a Governor or mayor who wishes to promote equal employment opportunities finds the most energetic and enthusiastic proponent he can hire and puts him in charge of an agency whose purpose is to promote equal employment opportunities. What he should do instead is put that man in charge of the highway department.

A discussion of techniques of exclusion has been postponed until this point because it is really impossible to discuss without making program recommendations, or to make program recommendations without discussing techniques of exclusion. We are not concerned here with overt and explicit techniques, such as a "no colored" sign on the door. These can be dealt with in the courts or in the allocation of the Federal pie. The Civil Rights Act needs to be extended to governments for this purpose to be served effectively, but this, while difficult politically to accomplish, is not difficult to perceive as a need.

What does require discussion is the process that takes place after the sign has been removed. Most southern political leaders have discovered that the sign wasn't really necessary anyway. Perhaps the most important single technique that is employed after the sign is taken down is simply to do nothing. Most southern blacks have learned that words are only one of several means of communication and frequently not the most explicit; they have also learned that trouble-avoidance is a primary goal in their relations with the white community. Taking down the sign will not, except in a rare community which has been stirred up to take collective action, result in a line of black applicants. It will be the signal, rather, to watch and wait for some more explicit communication. If nothing happens, this means that nothing is changed, and in the interest of trouble-avoidance the blacks will continue as before.

Trouble-avoidance is rational behavior, and an educational campaign aimed at its elimination would be misplaced effort. What is needed, rather, is the manipulation of the situation so that trouble-avoidance is consistent with walking through the door from which the sign has been removed and filling out a job application. A black who would enthusiastically support a bus boycott would sensibly hesitate to pass through that door, because in the bus boycott he has the protection of being part of a mass action. The main obstacle in voter-registration drives is in getting the first few registrants; after that, it too is a mass action. This obstacle is dealt with by sending in crowds of Federal marshals and FBI agents during the early stages of a voter-registration drive to provide security during that temporary period when it is required. The blacks know that in a short time the Federals will be gone, and power will have been restored to the local police chief, landlord, banker, grocer, and so on, but by then they will be among hundreds or thousands of black registrants, and hence relatively safe from the community's sanctions. An applicant for government employment, however, when his aspiration is higher than the unskilled labor level, is always an individual, an uppity black; and the community's sanctions can be awesome when applied against an individual. What is required here is the creation of explicit mass support for the individual. When the "colored only" sign comes down, the black community should meet, encourage one or more of its members to apply for a specific opening, and promise to share with him whatever hazards result. If the bank calls in his loan, they will raise the money to pay it off, and withdraw their business from that bank; if his landlord evicts him, or his house is bombed, they will take him into their homes; if he is harassed on the job, they will come and stand menacingly around the building.

If we look at this problem from the point of view of an administrator who really wants to provide equal

employment opportunities–that is, the problem of how to get black applicants after the offending sign has been removed–the program recommendation in general terms is that he must establish contacts with the black community, through which he can learn of potential applicants, and then he must go to those people and try to persuade them to apply. He must visit black schools and colleges as a recruiter. These techniques have long been employed in getting white applicants, after all; the only difference is that they are done routinely or even unconsciously. The administrator already has his contacts in the white community. When he mentions to his good friend Fred over a cocktail at the country club that there is an opening in the auditing department that might interest Fred Jr., he does not think of himself as employing a recruitment technique. A great many government positions are filled in this manner, however, and simply to equalize employment opportunities requires that a conscious and deliberate effort be made to do the same in the black community.

Once an applicant has come through the door, it is still true that the most effective technique of exclusion is to follow established routine. This is so because in most cases there is some established and supposedly objective test of an applicant's qualifications, and in most cases the black applicant will fail this test, or pass it with a lower score than several white applicants. There has not been a great deal of quantitative research in this area, but one study of about 100,000 applicants for State and county government positions in California showed that 51.6 percent of white applicants pass the written test, as compared to 25.8 percent of black applicants. Since virtually all civil service laws requiring examinations permit final selection to be made from among the top three, it is almost impossible, statistically speaking, for an agency head to find himself forced to make good on a commitment to equal employment opportunity.

This is ironic because the merit system civil service laws were originally passed to eliminate discriminatory hiring practices not based on the applicant's ability to do the job. True, no one was much concerned in this connection about discrimination against blacks–it was discrimination against people who were well-qualified but not related to the local political boss or a block worker in his campaign. The solution was a system which generally allowed some choice, but only among applicants who had been demonstrated to be highly qualified. It would seem that this must surely help black applicants at least as much as anyone else, but in fact it has emerged as one of the strongest barriers to black employment in nontraditional government jobs. The beauty of this from the segregationist viewpoint is that the laws were passed a long time ago, for another and very worthy purpose, frequently at the urging of the Federal Government, and that they have long since been upheld by the courts.

What went wrong breaks down into two problem areas: Tests frequently are not relevant to job requirements, and tests frequently are culturally biased. When they are both, they systematically rank less well-qualified whites above better qualified blacks. This situation came into being largely through inadvertence, but it now serves a very special purpose of a powerful interest group and will not easily be changed.

The irrelevance of written qualifying examinations results from the fact that the same law which requires them to be used prevents them from being tested for validity. To validate a test for, say, truckdrivers, you would administer the test to a large number of people, put them all to work as truckdrivers, then evaluate their work as truckdrivers, and finally see if there is any correlation between score on the test and performance on the job. Civil service laws require, however, that only those receiving high scores be employed, so that there is no way of comparing score and performance for low-scorers. Of course, if the tests cannot be tested for validity, they cannot be proven irrelevant. Many of them, however, make no claim of special relevance, being merely general reading speed and comprehension tests or general intelligence tests, and many of the people who work with them believe they are irrelevant (e.g., "We're testing for something, but we don't know what." F. Joseph Rosati, Chief, Welfare Merit Systems Bureau, State Department of Social Welfare, Sacramento, Calif. quoted in U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *For All the People, by All the People,* Washington, D.C., 1969, p. 41.)

If tests were merely irrelevant, their effect would be neutral; for them to be negatively selective of qualified blacks, they must be irrelevant *and* culturally biased. The latter problem affects, or course, much more than civil service examinations; it affects texts and tests and other teaching materials in schools, most importantly. Authors assume prior knowledge on the part of new readers in such fields as raising a pet puppy, going for a drive in the country to visit grandparents, eating in a restaurant, shopping at the supermarket, vacationing at a seaside resort, and going to the airport to meet daddy, because these materials are written by people who grew up in white, middle-class suburbia, for whom, and among whose acquaintances, these were common experiences. No one has written them that way because he wanted to make it hard for a black or Puerto Rican child from the urban slum to learn to read, but the result is the same. Cultural bias in civil service exams results from

the exams being prepared by people who don't know, don't think about the fact, or are unable to cope with the problem that a good deal of what seems to them the shared experience of all mankind is really the distinctive background of an exclusive group. There are in general three ways to deal with the problem of bias. One is to identify and eliminate it; another is to develop different tests for people from different cultural backgrounds; and the third is to eliminate written tests for most positions. The first is difficult because the bias is pervasive and may even be inherent in the written test per se. The second would result in separate and not directly comparable civil service rosters. The third solution appears preferable in all cases where it is feasible. Written tests would be replaced by performance tests. A truckdriver would be tested in driving a truck, a typist in typing, a window washer in washing windows, etc. Like anything else, the purposes of such tests may be perverted; but they can be valid and unbiased for most kinds of jobs in the public service.

A program designed to identify and devise means of eliminating such barriers to minority employment has been undertaken by the National Civil Service League, with funding by the Office of Economic Opportunity. The League has a long record of support for merit system examinations for civil service employment, but has recently begun to experience second thoughts about their merits and is now actively involved in seeking out and testing alternative selection procedures. Its program, called "Pacemaker," has so far achieved some measure of acceptance in 10 municipal governments and eight States, including Arkansas, North Carolina, and the city of Atlanta. In Wilmington, Del., (outside the coverage of this report) it has achieved perhaps its greatest success. There, all written tests have been eliminated. A personnel board recommends three applicants on the basis of training and experience. If a minority candidate among the three is not selected by the appointing official, he is required to state his reasons in writing. The program has not been in effect long enough for an evaluation to be made, but certainly it deserves to be tried in a larger number of southern jurisdictions. Another finding of the League is an unexpected asset of token integration: a black in the office makes it a great deal easier to get black applicants to come in. Obviously this is most effective if the token black is a personnel officer, interviewer, or receptionist; but the effect is present if he or she is merely visible.

For the black who has passed the qualifying examination, the final obstacle to employment is the common rule of three—the rule, that is, that the names of the three applicants with the highest scores will be referred to the employing agency for final selection. The rule is in part a recognition of the fact that tests are imperfect and in part a recognition that factors such as a sunny disposition are relevant too. Obviously, however, the rule provides the final barricade against the black applicant, since it is extremely improbable that the three top scorers would all be black. One way to eliminate this problem is to eliminate the rule and send only the top name to the agency. The difficulties with this approach are: The examinations really are far from perfect; factors other than those tested frequently really are important; not many more blacks would be hired under a rule of one; and agency heads who really wanted to provide equal employment opportunities would be denied the flexibility of the rule of three.

In sum, there appear to be only two ways to equalize employment opportunities in State and local government without Federal intervention. One is to put men who are committed to the ideal of equal employment opportunities in charge of agencies; the other is to organize each agency's constituency as a pressure group. Most equalization that has come about has done so because of constituency pressure. Constituency pressure is, however, effective only in cases where the agency has direct contact with an identifiable constituency. In other cases, an agency head has had virtually unlimited power, without ever performing an explicitly racist act, to keep his agency as white as he wanted it.

Responding to this situation by suggesting that the Governor appoint integrationist agency heads does not really solve it, because many agency heads are not appointed and many governors are not committed to integration. If we look instead at the question of what an outside force, such as the Federal Government, might do, the conclusion seems abundantly clear that negative requirements will accomplish little or nothing. That is, the prohibition of discriminatory hiring practices will not result in much change in hiring practices or in the racial patterns of employment. If anything is going to be accomplished, it evidently will have to be through positive requirements, such as the assignment of quotas of black employees by category, which must be filled if Federal financial assistance is to be continued or initiated. Concurrently, the Federal Government should encourage the establishment of special outreach programs to get people into training programs geared to public employment. Quotas are not likely to be effective if there really are no qualified blacks to fill jobs.

Training programs can be effective in at least three types of situations, all of which are quantitatively important in the southern job market. Where agency heads and personnel officers are not committed to the principle of

equal employment opportunity, and use the administrative discretion permitted in most merit systems to rule black applicants unqualified, such objective evidence as a certificate of completion of an appropriate course of training will make such administrative decisions less defensible. Where irrelevant and biased testing procedures frustrate honest efforts to increase black employment, training programs can be devised which provide training not so much for the job as for the test. Such programs have long existed to assist, for example, white Anglo-Saxon Protestants who wish to enter the foreign service. A cram course is not a satisfactory solution to the problem of a bad test, but given the length of time required to change entrenched civil service procedures and attitudes, use of the device is fully justified as a temporary expedient. Finally, it must be recognized that one product of the long history of poverty, inferior education, and limited employment opportunities is that a significant proportion of the black population really is unqualified for nontraditional government employment. Short-course training programs can hardly be expected to erase the cumulative effects of generations of oppression, but they can be an effective tool to open a gap in this vicious circle.

The recommendation for quotas of black employees by category, as an eligibility condition for Federal financial assistance, is consistent with recent Federal court decisions. A 1969 ruling stated that on a school staff which is being reduced, an educator who is released may not be replaced by one of another race. The Columbus, Miss., decision of 1971, discussed above, required the school district to maintain the same proportion of black teachers that had existed before segregation. In the State of Alabama case, already cited, the judge, in ruling against the State, did not even bother to require it to declare that the civil service in federally aided agencies was open to all races and colors, although its refusal to do so had been the offense that originally brought down the Federal wrath. Instead the court ordered the State to offer suitable employment to some 62 specifically named black applicants for positions as clerks, typists, caseworkers, etc., to modify the rule of three by always making an offer to a black before a lower ranked white and to carry out or desist from a large number of other carefully specified practices. For temporary employees above the custodial and unskilled levels, it ordered "temporary appointments . . .so that the ratio of black to white temporary appointments each year is substantially the same as such ratio is for the Negro and white population in the State of Alabama."

Subsequent word-of-mouth reports indicate that this approach, by the court in Alabama, has been successful in that State officials appear to have concluded that maintaining a discriminatory hiring policy is not worth the trouble and expense. This is a hopeful sign. It would be an intolerable situation if Federal courts throughout the South (and perhaps throughout the Nation) had to maintain continuous and detailed supervision over the personnel practices, down to the minutest detail, of all State and local agencies. If the threat of such intervention can be made real by its use in a few cases, however, with the result that it appears to have had in Alabama, it could become an effective instrument of Federal power for the achievement of equality in employment opportunities.

Under present legislation, however, the possible applications of such power are severely limited. There is no blanket requirement that State agencies which receive Federal funds must maintain nondiscriminatory hiring policies. This requirement has been written into, or omitted from the acts of Congress for each individual program. Congress has thus seen fit to prohibit discrimination in employment in federally aided State programs for vocational rehabilitation, aid to the blind and to crippled children, civil defense, and a number of others which involve insignificant numbers of jobs, while it has conspicuously failed to apply the same prohibition to some of much greater significance. Most notably, Congress annually contributes vast sums to highway programs administered by the States, while imposing no limitations on their use of restrictive hiring practices. Police departments, both State and local, are now receiving substantial Federal aid, yet where they are becoming integrated it is only as a result of client pressure. State-operated agricultural extension services are notoriously segregated and heavily subsidized by the Federal Government. It is not immediately obvious why entire State and local governments should not be included in the fair employment provisions of the Civil Rights Act, but at least those agencies subsidized by the Federal Government should be dealt with consistently. The omission is not inadvertent. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits the discriminatory use of Federal funds by aided agencies, specifically excludes employment practices from its coverage "except where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance is to provide employment." [Sec. 604.]

In general, we have found evidence of significant and rapid change in the opportunities for employment in State and local governments of black Americans living in the South. Although virtually all of the change can be classified as improvement—the principal exception being in the public schools—it varies substantially in both degree and type. Variations in degree can usually be accounted for by variations in the intensity of the pressure for change that has been exerted. This is a joint function

of initial force and its distance from the point of contact. A relatively small amount of force exerted by an agency's director or its constituency can produce very intense pressure for change. If the force emanates, on the other hand, from northern newspapers, or Washington, or even the Governor's office, it must be considerably greater to be effective.

Variations in the type of change seem to be related to the source of pressure rather than to its intensity. Pressure from higher administrative levels has characteristically been associated with token integration. This does not reflect on the motives of those who have exerted the pressure. Several southern Governors and mayors are deeply committed to changing the image of their communities as racist societies. Many Federal administrators of programs involving the cooperation of State and local agencies are zealous in the cause of equality in employment opportunity. Token integration remains, however, an effective response to such pressure. This need not be a setback. Token integration can reduce the resistance of white employees and supervisors to further integration, and it can also enhance the willingness of blacks to apply for additional positions in the agency. It does not, however, achieve the goal of equal employment opportunity, and it does involve the danger of diminishing or eliminating the pressure that brought about the initial change.

An agency's constituency as the source of pressure for change, on the other hand, typically produces what has been termed "the new segregation," or the creation of "new traditional Negro jobs." Black patrolmen and State liquor store managers in black neighborhoods, black employment counselors and public welfare administrators serving the black poor—these are rapidly becoming the rule rather than the exception, not only in the South, but throughout the Nation. This is a tremendous step forward, on two fronts. The effect on employment opportunities is obvious; in addition, however, the change has produced a notable improvement in the quality of government services rendered to black citizens. No doubt whites have the inherent capacity to counsel unemployed blacks and whites with equal skill and effectiveness; no doubt some have even done so and are now doing so. Given, however, the actual situation and its background of noncommunication and mutual distrust, there are few blacks and whites who can talk freely to each other or fully understand each other. Until a generation of Americans has grown up in a truly integrated society, this new segregation will continue to serve a real and urgent need. It remains true, however, that like token integration it is something other than the goal of equal employment opportunity and that its potential as a source of jobs for blacks is limited.

So few examples of the third type, true integration, have been found that any generalizations about the sources of the pressure that have produced it must be tentative. So far as we can determine, however, it has come about either as a result of pressure generated within the agency itself or through actions of the Federal courts. The first case is represented by a few public institutions of higher education. It is notorious that such agencies tend to be staffed by people who are highly cosmopolitan in outlook and origin, highly educated, and highly independent in their thinking. The possibility of these conditions being reproduced in other agencies is negligible. The second case, on the other hand, is limited in its possible extent only by the will of Congress, in providing appropriate legislation, and the will of the Department of Justice in promoting its enforcement.

The position of the Federal Government is thus both strategic and ambiguous. It is the one agent of change which can be effective over a broad spectrum in achieving true equality of employment opportunity in State and local governments. Some of the most significant victories that have been won in this struggle have been won because of the deliberate and effective use of available pressure by Congress, the courts, and many committed individuals within the executive branch of the Federal Government. When all this has been said, however, it remains true that most employment in State and local governments in the South is still not open to blacks on a basis of equality with whites, and that this is so because of the failure of the Federal Government to exert available pressure. In some areas, Congress has deliberately refrained from providing the necessary legislative authority; in others, such authority has been left unused, due to indifference, oversight, lack of adequate staff and budget, vulnerability to counterpressure, or perhaps commitment to a different set of principles.

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1973 O—512-380 (52)

WHERE TO GET MORE INFORMATION

For more information on manpower programs and services in your area, contact your local employment service office or the nearest office of the Regional Manpower Administrator at the address listed below.

Location	States Served	
Room 1703 John F. Kennedy Bldg. Boston, Mass. 02203	Connecticut Maine Massachusetts	New Hampshire Rhode Island Vermont
37th Floor 1515 Broadway New York, N. Y. 10036	New Jersey New York Canal Zone	Puerto Rico Virgin Islands
P. O. Box 8796 Philadelphia, Pa. 19101	Delaware Maryland Pennsylvania	Virginia West Virginia
D. C. Manpower Administrator Room 220, District Bldg. 14th and E Streets, NW. Washington, D. C. 20004	District of Columbia	
Room 405 1371 Peachtree Street, NE. Atlanta, Ga. 30309	Alabama Florida Georgia Kentucky	Mississippi North Carolina South Carolina Tennessee
300 South Wacker Drive Chicago, Ill. 60606	Illinois Indiana Michigan	Minnesota Ohio Wisconsin
Room 3000, Fed. Bldg. 911 Walnut Street Kansas City, Mo. 64106	Iowa Kansas	Missouri Nebraska
Room 6B7 1100 Commerce Street Dallas, Tex. 75202	Arkansas Louisiana New Mexico	Oklahoma Texas
Federal Office Bldg. Room 16015 1961 Stout Street Denver, Colo. 80202	Colorado Montana North Dakota	South Dakota Utah Wyoming
Room 10108, Fed. Bldg. 450 Golden Gate Avenue San Francisco, Calif. 94102	Arizona California Hawaii Nevada	American Samoa Guam Trust Territory
Room 2154, Arcade Plaza 1321 Second Avenue Seattle, Wash. 98101	Alaska Idaho	Oregon Washington